JPRS-TAC-86-016

12 February 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-016

12 February 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: Shultz Declares U.S. Intention To Continue SDI
(Moscow TASS, 26 Jan 86; Moscow TASS International Service, 27 Jan 86) 1

'Clear and Firm Stand' 1
'Does Not Correspond to Reality', by Vladimir Chernyshev 1

TASS: U.S. 'Shielding' Plans To Militarize Space
(Vladimir Bogachev; Moscow TASS International Service, 17 Jan 86) 3

U.S. Increase in Pressure on Japan Hit by IZVESTIYA
(S. Agafonov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27 Jan 86) 4

IZVESTIYA Cites French Defense Minister on SDI
(Yu. Kovalenko; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27 Jan 86) 6

European Participation in SDI Probed
(KAPITAL & BUSINESS, No 15, Fall 1985) 7

Briefs
NATO Commander on European Role 16
Weinberger Talks With Bangemann Begin 16

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR Notes Foreign Reaction to Gorbachev's 15 January Proposal
(Various Sources, various dates) 17

Nonaligned Movement 17
IZVESTIYA Cites Jaruzelski 18
Workers Congress Studies Proposals 18
Honecker Praises Program 19
GDR Disarmament Official Cited 20

Bulgarian Foreign Minister Quoted 20
Netherlands Stance 21
Spanish Communist Party 21
U.S. Senators Cited 22
Australian Foreign Minister 23
Genscher Cited 23
DKP's Mies on Proposal 23
Lao President Cited 24
Libyan Support 25
Libyan External Relations Official 25
Gandhi Terms Statement 'Encouraging' 26
Austrian Communist Party Leader 26
Italian Communist Praises Proposal 26
Greek Prime Minister 27
Cambodian Statement 27
Sweden's Palme 28
Bulgarian Official Lauds Initiative 28
SRV's Pham Van Dong 29
SRV's Nguyen Huu Tho, by M. Domogatskikh 29
SRV State Council Chairman 30

Press Conference Held To Discuss Gorbachev's Proposal
(Moscow PRAVDA, 19 Jan 86; Moscow Television Service, 18 Jan 86) 31

PRAVDA Report 31
'Vremya' Coverage 39
Diagram at Press Conference 44

Gorbachev's Proposal Discussed During Shevardnadze's Japan Trip
(Moscow TASS, 16 Jan 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Jan 86) 46

Meets With Abe 46
Press Conference, Departure Reported 48

Supreme Soviet Sends Message to U.S. Congress
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 20 Jan 86) 50

Soviet Correspondents Examine Chances for Progress at Talks
(Moscow TASS, 16 Jan 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 16 Jan 86) 54

'Moments That Give Rise to Concern' 54
'Responsible Approach' Essential, by Sergey Pravdin 55

PRAVDA: Reagan 'Resorts to Selective Interpretation'
(Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Jan 86) 56

Soviet General Sees U.S. 'Undermining' Geneva Results
(Mikhail Yasyukov Interview; Moscow International Service 14 Jan 86) 57

IZVESTIYA: Kennan Exemplifies Changing U.S. Attitudes
(Vikentiy Matveyev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 17 Jan 86) 59

LE MONDE Views Gorbachev's Nuclear Weapons Plan
(Editorial; Paris LE MONDE, 17 Jan 86) 62

USSR's Zagladin on International Issues in Hungarian Paper
(Vadim Zagladin Interview; Budapest NEPSZABADSAG, 11 Jan 86) 64

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: U.S. Bears Onus for European Nuclear Problem
(Moscow TASS, 22 Jan 86) 69

USSR's Zholkver Views NATO Exercises in West Germany
(Aleksandr Zholkver; Moscow Domestic Service, 21 Jan 86) 71

Paris Daily Analyzes Euromissiles Proposal
(Michel Tatu; Paris LE MONDE, 17 Jan 86) 73

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: MBFR Talks Resume; Opportunity for Accord
(Moscow TASS, 27 Jan 86; Vienna DIE PRESSE, 27 Jan 86) 75

Soviet Delegation Arrives 75
MBFR Agreement 'Possible', by N. Petrov 75

Moscow Comments on Ninth CDE Session in Stockholm
(Various sources, various dates) 77

Reagan Issues Statement 77
Number of Unresolved Issues 77
USSR Proposes 'Constructive Measures', by
Aleksandr Zholkver 78
Delegates' Remarks 79
Notification Changes Proposed, by Georgiy Zubkov 80
Soviet Proposals Provide Key, by Valentin Gubernatorov 81
'Political Baggage' at Talks 82

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: SHULTZ DECLARES U.S. INTENTION TO CONTINUE SDI

'Clear and Firm Stand'

LD262025 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 26 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 26 TASS -- As U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz declared unambiguously, the Washington administration is not going to give up the implementation of its plans to militarise outer space. It follows from his interview to the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT weekly that the United States will implement the programme of research set out in the "Strategic Defense Initiative" and will not be imposing any restrictions on this research. Shultz stressed that the President holds a clear and firm stand on the matter.

'Does Not Correspond to Reality'

LD271444 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 27 Jan 86

[TASS military observer Vladimir Chernyshev commentary]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jan (TASS) -- In an interview with U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has stated that the United States will continue to implement SDI -- that is the "star wars" program -- and that "no changes in this program are foreseen."

At the same time, the secretary of state asserted that the United States is "holding talks sincerely in Geneva." According to elementary logic one of these two assertions is false because they cannot both correspond to the truth at the same time. If anyone in Washington knows that, then George Shultz should.

First, it was the secretary of state who on behalf of his administration and together with the Soviet foreign minister drew up the joint Soviet-U.S. statement last January which, in defining the aims of the talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, clearly and unambiguously speaks of achieving an effective accord aimed at averting the arms race in space. Second, through his official duties G. Shultz should know that at the November 1985 summit the U.S. President signed a joint declaration which confirmed the stated aim -- the nonmilitarization of space. How then can the head of the foreign policy department juxtapose an assertion on "the sincere conduct"of the Geneva talks by the United States with a statement on the firm adherence by that same United States to a program aimed at militarizing space?

Not just Shultz, not just Washington, but the whole world knows the cause of the lack of progress at the Geneva talks: The United States is not carrying out the accord that was reached, is stubbornly avoiding a ban on space strike weapons, and is attempting to legalize the "star wars" program. While perfectly aware that keeping space free of weapons has a decisive significance for nuclear arms reductions, Washington continues to take ever new steps on the path to the implementation of SDI and heaps up ever more obstacles on the road to working out mutually acceptable decisions at Geneva.

Washington's position has become particularly unattractive now that the Soviet Union has proposed a concrete program, calculated for an historically short period, for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons in the world, when a real opportunity has arisen to do away with the nuclear threat through joint efforts. In such a situation, which makes the direct elimination of all nuclear weapons possible, the call to pile new mountains of weapons right up to the heights of space and even to speak of official Washington's alleged desire to "eliminate the nuclear threat" is at the least, not serious and to put it simply, is ridiculous.

Let us take another passage from Mr Shultz. Again he is talking about the "research" nature of the "star wars" program. This assertion once again, to put it mildly, does not correspond to reality. Work on this program is being conducted according to the instructions and contracts of the military department and at the stage when mockups and experimental models have to appear, field tests and finishing work is being done outside the laboratory. Surely Shultz knows that the Pentagon has already allocated 1,500 contracts for the "star wars" program, that the biggest military-industrial corporations are mastering the allocations made for these ends, and that not only in scientific laboratories, but in the works of these corporations high-energy laser installations, beam weapons systems, electromagnetic guns, and so on are being perfected? And what can the U.S. secretary of state say about the fact that concrete antimissile models for destroying targets outside the atmosphere and in the upper levels of the atmosphere are being developed on such Pentagon contracts as ("Hedi") ("Headeye"), and ("Braiduskill"). Can that also be regarded as "research" to Washington's way of thinking? Then what, in Mr G. Shultz's opinion is the weapons development called?

The time has come to become imbued with a sense of responsibility, to move over to political thinking which corresponds to the realities of the nuclear space age, and to reconsider Washington's approach to the most important problems of the present time. In the first place the representatives of the U.S. Administration need to remove the contradictions between their words and deeds.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1240

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. 'SHIELDING' PLANS TO MILITARIZE SPACE

LD171750 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 17 Jan 86

[TASS observer Vladimir Bogachev commentary: "The United States Shields Its Plans To Militarize Space -- Something New in Washington's Rhetoric"]

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jan (TASS) -- In the last 3 years the world public has come to completely objective conclusions withregard to the true aims of the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" and this circumstance is forcing Washington's official representatives to resort to the most fantastic "arguments" aimed at shielding [vygorodit] U.S. plans to militarize space.

U.S. propaganda recently declared that Washington could even renounce its "star wars" plans on the condition that the Soviet Union admits to violating the Treaty on Limitation of antiballistic Missile Systems and to conducting research aimed at creating antiballistic missile strike weapons in space. Keep the United States company, they say, in the "club of international agreements violators" and Washington will try to find a common language with the Soviet Union.

The meaning of this casuistic "initiative" consists in presenting the work, being conducted for the creation of U.S. strike weapons in space and in violation of the ABM Treaty, as a measure by the United States in answer to Soviet actions.

Scientific research work in the field of space is really being carried out in the Soviet Union, including that in the military sphere. But this work is connected with the improvement of space systems for early warning, exploration [tazvedka also means mineral prospecting, reconnaissance and intelligence], communications, and navigation. The Soviet Union unswervingly clings to the provisions of the indefinite Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty and is creating no space strike weapons or antimissile defense for the country.

The Soviet side recently made a proposal on the use of the strictest measures for control in observation of the accord [dogovorennost] on the nonmilitarization of space, including opening up the relevant laboratories for inspection. For a long time the United States has used the problem of verification of the observation of agreements [soglasheniya] as an "argument" for justifying its refusal to reduce armaments.

Unfortunately, there are grounds for supposing that the U.S. Administration even now has not changed its negative attitude to the Soviet proposals for averting the arms race in space, having merely used new, groundless "arguments" in defense of its unconstructive position.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1240

U.S. INCREASE IN PRESSURE ON JAPAN HIT BY IZVESTIYA

PM271345 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Agafonov: "The Pentagon's Demands"]

[Text] Tokyo -- American pressure on its allies on the question of their involvement in the program to create space-based strike weapons continues to increase.

Since Bonn and London have yielded to pressure from Washington, "star wars" lobbyists are laying the main stress on Tokyo, which has not yet made a final decision on this problem.

As the Japanese press reports, the conservative American organization, the Heritage Foundation, which is considered the brain trust of the current White House administration, has prepared a report entitled "SDI Prospects for Asia." It formulates recommendations, the chief of which consists in the following: Involving Japan in implementation of the "star wars" program must be in the United States' prime task.

"Japanese technology is equal to American technology in many spheres, and, in a number of cases, leaves U.S. achievement behind," the report states. "Japanese participation in SDI will depend to a decisive extent on general progress in the sphere of the transfer of military technology from Japan to the United States."

Posing the issue in this way not only confirms American interest in Japanese scientific and technological achievements, but also indicates the mechanism, within the framework of which Tokyo's participation in SDI could be realized. The latter is particularly worthy of note, because here we have an attempt to present Japanese involvement in the "star wars" program not as a political step, but as a formal procedural issue relating only to expanding the sphere of working consultations between allies.

In actual fact, if we were to suppose that American demands connected with SDI were to be presented as ordinary demands for Japanese military technology in accordance with the agreement signed in 1983, when the very problem of Tokyo's participation in the preparations for "star wars" would be eroded to such an extent that it would cease to be considered a problem. The government would thereby be rid of painful debates with the opposition and protests by antiwar movements, and the Pentagon would get everything it is seeking.

Will the subterfuge work? As yet it is difficult to say. According to the latest official statements by Japanese political figures, Tokyo's position in relation to

the "star wars" program has not changed: Japan expresses "understanding" of this program and is still "studying" it.

Within the framework of this "study" the second research group from Japan, headed by (R. Onodera), adviser to the Japanese ministry of Foreign Affairs, is at present in the United States. According to a report by the KYODO agency, the group has already visited the Pentagon's "space projects" and met with the head of the SDI program, General Abrahamson. Whether the American general was guided by the report by the Heritage Foundation in his talk with the Japanese representatives is unknown. But we can be totally clear on the fact that Washington is seriously getting down to working on Tokyo in the question of preparation for "star wars."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1240

IZVESTIYA CITES FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER ON SDI

PM271457 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Yu. Kovalenko: "The Position Is Changing?"]

[Text] Paris -- The newspaper LE MATIN, which is close to the authorities, reports a statement by P. Quiles, French defense minister, to the effect that the French Government has a positive attitude toward participation by French enterprises in the "Strategic Defense Initiative".... It would be a pity, he said, if they were unable to participate in contracts with Americans in the implementation of SDI. This is the first time since debates on the European attitude toward this American program began, LE MATIN points out, that Paris has thus spoken in favor of involvement by French companies in SDI.

According to the newspaper, scientists at a laboratory in Marcoussis, the scientific research center for the firm Compagnie Generale d'Electricite (work is being conducted there to create laser weapons), whom P. Quiles was addressing, were staggered by these words.

Although the minister's statement does not cast doubt on the fact that France is against SDI at state level, the newspaper stresses, it nevertheless attests to the evolution of Paris' position on this question. Until very recently, LE MATIN writes in conclusion, the government has not supported French firms such as Matra and Thomson, which have declared their intention to join the American programs connected with SDI.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1240

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

EUROPEAN PARTICIPATION IN SDI PROBED

Unknown KAPITAL & BUSINESS in Dutch No 15, Fall 1985 pp 27-31

[Article: "Strategic Defense: What's In It For Us?"]

[Text] When President Reagan uttered the first words about Strategic Defense in March 1983, very few people had ever thought about the idea of defense from space against a massive nuclear attack. Or better: after seeing "Star Wars" (the movie, that is), many people fantasized about space overflowing with space stations and ultrafast space tools. Once they came to their senses, however, everyone realized that nothing of this nature was in store for the present. A defense plan such as this would be feasible neither technologically nor financially.

When a budget proposal for a highly-developed program was introduced in the U.S. Congress on 1 February 1984, many people were dumbfounded. This meant that the White House was prepared to accept the political consequences of a project that over a period of 5 years would cost no less than $26 billion! Various reports (including the "Technology Plan" of the Defensive Technology Study Team--DTS) also contended that the Strategic Defense Initiative is technologically feasible, naturally provided that political and financial willingness could be mustered.

Against the current of pacifist protest and propaganda set in motion by the East, who spread around the most peculiar visions of a so-called "star war," the U.S. Congress gave the green light last October. The aforementioned amount of money is extended over the period from 1985 to 1989, which means that already this year funding has been made available to the SDIO, the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization. The SDIO is responsible for the planning, budgeting, execution...of the entire project, although the funding is largely in the hands of the cabinet departments. Only a modest part of the budget is directly controlled by the SDIO. The SDIO functions at the same time as a promotional organization, although some see SDIO more as a potential "good customer" on the order books. Certainly not without reason.

Only the United States?

Initially, the DTS pointed out that SDI would need $2.385 billion in its first year of operation. For budgetary reasons, the Department of Defense cut the

proposal back to $1.777 billion, but Congress insisted on a further reduction to $1.4 billion. Nevertheless, the Americans are at any rate prepared to strive for the set objectives in 1986.

There is a serious amount of money involved here, and as a consequence American industry is furiously raking in the orders. It is not only industry, however, but also the academic world. For many, SDI is in fact not only a military project, but also a project from which the industrial and scientific spin-off could be gigantic. No single government initiative, anywhere in the world, has ever managed to allot so much money, directly or indirectly, to scientific research (except in the Soviet Union, where the distinction between economic and scientific production and military development is not made). And, as Professor Desmond Smith of Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh says: "You don't refuse money when it is offered to you for basic research."

At the moment, 800 research projects within the framework of SDI are already on their feet. These programs are in part assigned to divisions of the U.S. Department of Defense and other departments, as well as to specialized sections of the Army itself. On the other hand, a considerable number of the programs are being contracted out to the private sector.

Only the American private sector? No, the SDIO report that was presented to Congress this year clearly states that the United States will regularly consult its Western allies about SDI in the coming years by way of various channels, such as NATO. This consultation is to be on both a political and a technological level. In fact, the United States does not exclude the possibility that in the long run the development of SDI can be expanded to include strategic defense of Western Europe. At the same time, the United States is worried about industrial and scientific cooperation. Are they asking for money? Not initially, but what they are asking for is knowledge.

In 1983, President Reagan requested a report on American industrial and technological potential. This commission, headed by John A. Young, president of Hewlett-Packard, came up with a particularly interesting "feasibility" study. The Young Report was presented in January of this year, and according to its findings the United States has lost ground in quite a number of areas. The report stated that the United States has lost the lead in 7 of the 10 top categories of "high-tech," and that during the 1970s work productivity rose more sluggishly than in a large number of other industrialized countries. Which leads one to strongly suspect that the United States could use scientific input from the outside. Some contend that SDI is nothing more than a protectionist operation. The Man on the Moon project of the 1960s put no less than one and a half million people to work at the time, which amounted to a form of economic subsidy. Something that, in view of the philosophy in the White House, seems to us today to be impossible. Nevertheless, the parallel is striking, and this argument cannot be simply brushed aside. If this suspicion is confirmed, then it looks as if this new industrial revolution will again make the United States the world leader in various crucial sectors of science and trade.

Attention Called

What many people contend is true: Europe no longer scares the Americans by what it says or does. But one cannot expect much else, since they have not enjoyed much European public sympathy over the last 15 years. The Americans view this--perhaps justifiably so--as crude ingratitude for its large role in our security.

At first glance, West European government leaders and heads of state are not entirely happy with SDI. Once again it presents them with difficult political decisions, and definitive support for SDI is being delayed. However, the United States is not exactly stamping with impatience. After all, SDI will supposedly keep science and industry busy for another 20 or so years, and anything can happen in the meantime. Moreover, the Americans are in the meantime turning to Japan, where they can expect much greater political affability. Conclusion: if the Americans can get in Japan what they cannot find in Europe, then they will not wait until Europe is able to keep abreast. It is thus less a matter of scientific knowledge than of political readiness.

Saying that we do not stand a chance anyway in competition with Japanese and American high technology is not much help. This should provide the umpteenth example of our historical provincial mentality. We can crawl into our little corner and say that SDI is ushering in a new phase in the arms race (which is nonsense) and that the "others" are still overtaking us. At the same time we could contend that if we participated in SDI we might be tricked out of it later. However, all of this does nothing to change reality. Even without considering a number of political and military reasons, it is practically certain that Western Europe is going to have to learn to live with this reality...and is, moreover, going to have to play a role in it.

"Shopping List"

The SDI program is extremely complex. The pretty photographs and drawings in numerous publications depict only the most spectacular aspect of it: space tools. However, each of these "tools" is composed of hundreds and thousands of various parts originating from a similar variety of scientific methods of thinking and industrial production techniques. In addition, all these parts have to meet conditions imposed on them by outer space: the absence of oxygen, other gravitational forces, other relevant sources of energy, other forms of radiation.... Our knowledge about this is still relatively limited. There is a real possibility that West European companies and scientific institutions can make a contribution in the form of new know-how and new technologies. Certain companies are even ahead of the Americans and the Japanese in a number of areas. Indeed, even if they were not in the lead, this does not mean that those companies would not over the course of time succeed in becoming competitors and thus have a chance at the projects on the shopping list.

In the gamut of necessary technologies, it is possible to distinguish five priority aspects, for which there is the greatest amount of attention--and thus the greatest demand! One by one there are:

--The interception of projectiles (in this case, ICBMs) during the first two phases of the trajectory (boost phase and post-boost phase); what is involved here are lasers and particle beams, as well as chemical accelerators and electromagnetic sources of power. The vulnerability of the target, as well as the counter-measures taken to provide the target with extra protection, will determine the extent of force necessary.

--Observation of the target, including differentiation of the real target from decoys, and from matter suspended in space.

--Adequate "interceptors," intended for tracking the target during its entire flight; quite a number of these are necessary, and as a consequence an attempt must be made to achieve this at the lowest possible cost.

--The durability of the installations deployed in space, with respect to the protection of these installations against attack as well as to resistance to the natural environment in space.

--The realization of a system that guarantees an extremely high degree of readiness, and that at the same time can be examined and maintained regularly and inexpensively.

As far as these five aspects are concerned, it is assumed that control of the equipment in space will no longer present any problems by the end of this century. If one follows current trends, one knows that computer science is being elevated to a higher level every 3 to 4 years, by which this possibility appears to be in the cards. However, there are more serious problems associated in particular with the issues of readiness and especially of maintenance.

Thus, the task of the SDIO is far from simple. Consideration must be taken of not only scientific and technological knowledge, but also the present availability of systems and components, as well as companies and institutions that have already advanced further in a particular area. To that end, the SDIO is contacting governments, business federations, universities...in all friendly and interested countries, although in the end all these institutions must themselves provide the proposals. It is thus obvious that the blessing of government authorities is necessary first and foremost, because U.S. government policy is not oriented towards passing on to its partners.

The SDIO sees cooperation in the form of research programs shared by government laboratories, an exchange of scientists, the participation of foreign firms in projects assigned to American companies, or direct competition between foreign firms and American firms.

Belgium Too?

If there is already a provincial mentality in Europe, then it is often just as much the case in our own country. This is a reproach directed not towards particular persons or institutions as much as at the inferiority complex that has characterized our culture so often. It is true that through a number of political and economic miscalculations we have over the years fallen behind in

on a number of levels. But this does not mean that we have nothing to offer the world.

Take a company like CBL (Compagnie Belge de Lasers): This company can presently produce lasers with 5 kilowatt capability. Knowing that lasers will be necessary within the framework of SDI (see the first priority in technology in the list above) with a capability of 100 kilowatts or more, this appears to be very easy. Nevertheless, the present potential is of less importance than is willingness: it is sufficient to set higher objectives and to submit a proposal within the framework of one of the SDI projects; once the order has been promised, the necessary investment can presumably be drummed up without too much trouble so that very powerful lasers can be produced. This notion is not naive! One must in fact take into consideration the fact that Western technology will be influenced to an important extent by SDI: During the next 20 years quite a large number of new projects will be launched, and thus the idea is to jump on the bandwagon at the right moment, perhaps not until 5 or 10 years from now. An advance refusal to participate, however, would mean that a large number of opportunities in the near future could be lost.

The participation of West European science and industry in SDI can be viewed from various angles. It is first and foremost a fact that Belgian industry should not watch quietly from a corner. The SDIO will be issuing interim reports on a regular basis, providing information on new projects. Trade and industry must follow these closely and, if the opportunity presents itself, compete for an interesting contract.

Secondly, one should assume that programs will frequently be entrusted to American companies. The latter will thus act as head contactors for large projects, which implies that West European firms have a chance at getting subcontracts for a number of aspects of the main contract.

Thirdly, a large number of West European companies have branches or affiliate firms in the United States. This means that an American main contractor can implement the contract in cooperation with the main office or the affiliate in Europe. Something similar to this can come about if one is able to boast of one's own experience in maintaining good relations with American companies; firms, for example, that represent a European company on the American market and thus maintain contractual cooperation.

Fourthly, there is also an indirect benefit to be gained from the presence of American businesses in our country. Whenever such a company is awarded an SDI contract, the American headquarters can always--perhaps if faced with a lack of available capacity--decide to transfer a number of aspects of the contract to its foreign branches. This would not only be beneficial for employment there, but also have an interesting spin-off effect for suppliers and so on.

The most important conclusion to be drawn from this is that the most important ingredients for creating opportunity are on the one hand readiness and on the other hand a spirit of enterprise. The study published last 30 April in TECHNIVISIE can be cited in this respect. According to this study, our universities consider it feasible for us to elevate our laser technology, for example, to a higher level very quickly, through which it would be possible to

compete, even with American companies. The step that must be taken to get there is not that large, according to the report.

And there are a large number of other industries that could have a good chance for SDI participation. A company like Herbelith, for example, enjoys world reknown in the so-called "harding" of materials, as well as in the production of panels of synthetic resin for protection against atomic radiation or of ring insulators for strong current. On the other hand, a company like Barco Industries has an enormous amount of know-how in the manufacture of displays; displays are something that the SDI program badly needs all the way across the board, in view of the fact that "observing" plays a key role in all aspects of the plan (see again the list of priority technologies), in maintaining the equipment as well as in guidance, interception, differentiation...; research at Barco in this area is at a very high level.

A number of companies have a great deal to offer in radar technology, telecommunications, mirrors (an extremely important component of the SDI plan) as well.... We could go even further in enumerating the Belgian companies, or branches of foreign companies in our country, that have a serious chance--if they want it--at SDI contracts. But once again, everything will depend on the willingness and the spirit of enterprise of these companies.

Reserves

Some people contend that we clearly do not have enough experience to be able to match a high technological level such as this in terms of industry, to say nothing of science. For example, there is insufficient know-how in Belgium in the area of software calculations for radar tracking, at least for space applications. This may be true, but one must wonder whether it is then impossible to pull in foreign specialists to accomplish this.

One often-heard criticism of SDI is that before long the Americans will cause a gigantic brain drain, as a consequence of which the Europeans will in the future be left with mediocre scientists. A parallel is then drawn to the "Man on the Moon" project in the 1960s: Indeed, NASA--the U.S. space organization--is today staffed by a large number of foreign, highly qualified scientists. The counter-question is whether we as Europeans can then do nothing to get our top specialists to stay here.

The French government has provided a valuable answer to that question with the launching of its Eureka project. In a report published last June, Roland Dumas and Hubert Curien, the ministers of External Affairs and of Research and Technology, respectively, stated that technological progress can provide a guarantee for European autonomy in decision-making and independence. "Eureka" is by definition not a military project, and yet it touches on the military domain on various levels. The underlying intention of it is undoubtedly to hinder a "brain drain" to the United States (as well to Japan, where the United States has initiated talks on the SDI program). There is no doubt that "Eureka" is an interesting project, insofar as it would not imply any useless waste through overlaps with SDI. Thus, it would be of much more value if there came about talks between SDI and Eureka in order to possibly enable a division of responsibilities. Without yielding too much to the Americans in

the area of technology! Ultimately, such an approach is the only meaningful one, at least if we use the well-being of all Europeans and of the economic future as our guide.

The Eureka project also shows a few Gaullist traits. It is obvious that France wants to lead the umpteenth industrial revolution in Europe, which should give the country a few points in the political domain as well. This criticism is also raised about SDI to a certain extent. Nothing wrong in and of itself, but certainly a difficult situation.

What is the status of the issue of industrial property? If our companies get orders from main contractors, do they then keep the rights to their own technological input? Naturally there are various levels of so-called "confidentiality," but at present it is generally accepted that the rights to new discoveries go over to the main contractors. And that is somewhat intolerable to European companies--as well as to European politicians--and quite understandably so. It will be some time before an agreement is reached in that area. At any rate, the rules of the game will at least have to be determined in advance if one is to avoid unfortunate conflicts and friction.

To quote British Foreign Minister Sir Geoffrey Howe at the conclusion of the NATO meeting in Estoril at the beginning of June: "One would have been happier if there had been a full endorsement (...of the $26 billion research project, but...) it's no secret that there were various attitudes about the longer-term applications."

What Now?

Although Eureka masterfully plays on doubts surrounding SDI, one of the big obstacles to the French project is the fact that the Europeans have to put their own money into it. And since money is not cheap these days, this is indeed a problem. However, some French observers think that SDI and Eureka are not really competing with one another, so it thus appears that they too are looking for a compromise in order not to lose the battle against the financially alluring SDI.

For Belgian companies, it is at the moment rather difficult to predict prospects for participation in SDI. American officials seem to all but forget Belgium (we are, after all, pretty small!). In addition, the Americans have thus far released no lists of main contractors. The gathering of information is thus running into practical problems.

For its part, the Belgian government has set up a commission to look into SDI and possible cooperation. This group is headed by Frans Baekelandt, Belgian ambassador to The Hague, and it brings together a number of officials and authorities from the Ministries of Science Policy, Economic Affairs and Foreign Relations. In fact, a study is being done by Science Policy on the implications of SDI scientific matters. And there is someone in the prime minister's cabinet who is exclusively concerned with the coordination of the files.

Last 30 June, the time had come: the Baekelandt Commission, together with a few scientists, went to Washington for a first prospectus. Professor Van Overstraeten from the Catholic University of Louvain was quite delighted, and pledged his support for the possibility of research. Van Overstraeten has at his disposal a very good laboratory that could be of great service to certain SDI projects. Professor Elie Milgrom, another participant in the trip, viewed it somewhat differently: he finds the ideas interesting, but feels that everything is going too fast and that a certain amount of caution should be displayed. Bell Telephone and Claverbel went along with the Baekelandt group, but their position on the talks in the U.S. capital remains for the time being one of wait-and-see.

One peculiar thing about the entire matter is that the Flemish Economic League [VEV] is only slightly involved in the whole thing. It appears that the Belgian government views the VBO [League of Belgian Businesses] as the primary discussion partner. The VBO has in fact already set up an "SDI Commission" under the chairmanship of Etienne Davignon, former European Commissioner and at the moment director at the Generale. This commission largely corresponds to a group just set up during the summer months in the shadow of the VBO: Belgospace. Belgospace includes companies such as Fabrimetal, Bell Telephone, FN [Fabrique Nationale], SAIT [expansion unknown], Cockerill-Sambre, MBLE [expansion unknown], Sabca, Belgonucleaire, Glaverbel, ACEC [Ateliers de Constructions Electriques de Charleroi], CMI [expansion unknown], Metallurgie Hoboken and Sonaca; largely firms from the G holding company.

It is also this group that received an invitation to the gathering that is to take place in October on military property in Colorado Springs, in the United States. This invitation was sent by the SDIO to West European trade and industry (not the VEV), and the gathering is intended as the first big chance for these companies and SDI to get to know one another. At the same time, projects will be specifically laid out on the table, so that it will be possible to get an initial picture of the requirements and of the possibilities. Belgospace is at any rate participating in this top gathering. In view of the fact that Belgospace cooperates driectly with the ESA, the European Space Agency, one can also presume that there is somewhat more sympathy for Eureka from the VBO and the Generale; France has, after all, been the leader within the ESA (just think about the--finally successful--Ariane).

European Thinking?

Seventeen European countries, including even Switzerland, have given their conditional support to further research on Eureka. Inevitably, there must be talk of European cooperation and coordination, with respect to both Eureka and SDI. However, the fact that Eureka will in one way or another have to be built on the Esprit program, which has laid the cornerstone for European technological cooperation, does not imply that doors will be closed to SDI tomorrow. This would bear witness to a fundamentally wrong political decision and to limitless naivete.

Reference was made to an analysis of political implications in April of this year at a gathering in Bonn of the resurrected WEU, the West European Union. This attempt at a synthesis of the various opinions in force in Europe makes

it conclusively less easy; through this step, however, the opportunity was created for West European companies and governments to distance themselves from the "European position in the making," and, if they wish, to prospect for SDI projects. In other words: they got a little time.

One thing that is clear. however, is that the companies are not going to allow themselves to be dictated to by political decisions. In July, six or so companies and institutions had been assured of orders. By the end of October, perhaps by way of the gathering in Colorado Springs, this number will undoubtedly be much higher.

After the end of the first five-year plan of SDI, authorities in Washington will determine whether SDI should and can be implemented, based on the accumulated interim reports. By that time, it should also be clear whether the Europeans are definitely willing to cooperate. In other words, in 1990 both industrial and political willingness must be present. Should European confidence in Atlantic cooperation be lacking, the Americans will presumably "keep going without looking over their shoulders any more."

The dominant feeling in Flemish trade and industry is that SDI as an American concept should first of all be translated into European terms. A European concept of SDI could subsequently be expanded with an eye to both Eureka and Esprit. European unity is important in its own right.

And yet, although presently things are at times somewhat vague and there are still many "ifs" and "maybes," there is one thing that is absolutely clear: SDI is setting the scientific and industrial world in motion on an unheard-of scale, and the spin-off resulting from it is of such importance that no one, whatever their political point of view, can ignore this reality.

12271
CSO: 8018/0327

BRIEFS

NATO COMMANDER ON EUROPEAN ROLE--Washington, 15 Jan--American General B. Rogers, supreme commander of NATO allied armed forces in Europe, has proposed that Western Europe "begin its own parallel program" for the creation of space arms. "The West European countries," Rogers stressed in an interview for the weekly U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, "must jointly organize their research potential and obtain U.S. consent to the exchange of information so that each side can use the other's results." [TASS report] [Text] [Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jan 86 First Edition p 3 PM] /6091

WEINBERGER TALKS WITH BANGEMANN BEGIN--Washington, 15 Jan--Talks have begun here on the participation of West German companies in the U.S. "star wars" program between FRG Minister for Economics M. Bangemann and U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and other representatives of the Reagan administration. Commenting on the talks, THE WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper notes that Washington needs an official agreement between the two countries as a sign of approval for Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) on the part of U.S. allies in Western Europe, where it has aroused protests. [TASS report] [Text] [Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jan 86 First Edition p 3 PM] /6091

CSO: 5200/1240

USSR NOTES FOREIGN REACTION TO GORBACHEV'S 15 JANUARY PROPOSAL

Nonaligned Movement

LD190021 Moscow TASS in English 2322 GMT 18 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 18 TASS -- TASS commentator Aleksandr Bokhonko writes:

Rajiv Gandhi, chairman of the Non-aligned Movement, prime minister of India, and Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden, who is now in Delhi, have highly appreciated the large-scale Soviet initiatives contained in the statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. "The programme which has been put forward by the Soviet Union", Rajiv Gandhi pointed out, "is the alternative to a nuclear arms race in outer space. This is a search for real ways to rid the earth of nuclear weapons". According to Olof Palme, the USSR's decision to extend for three months the moratorium on any nuclear explosions "has given rise to new hope for stronger international peace".

It is noteworthy that this high appraisal has been expressed by the co-authors of the Delhi declaration of the six states. The declaration was signed a year ago, along with India and Sweden, by the leaders of Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, and Greece. The call contained in the declaration to fully end the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons, as well as of space arms, has found reflection and received further development in the Soviet leader's statement.

The Soviet Union has suggested a truly innovatory and bold solution to the problem of ridding mankind of nuclear nightmare. Before the peoples of the whole world, there opens up a real prospect of entering the year 2000 without nuclear weapons which, according to Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal, should be eliminated fully and everywhere in three stages in the course of 15 years, the Soviet Union has also suggested eliminating chemical weapons, and extending for three months the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. It is deeply symbolic that the Soviet Union's new peace drive has come about in the U.N. -designated International Year of Peace. Thus, the Soviet Union, setting an example to other countries, through concrete deeds proves its commitment to the cause of peace and peoples' security and to the removal of the danger of out-break of a nuclear conflict. The current preparation in the United States for "star wars" is being countered by the USSR with another kind of war -- a war on nuclear and space arms and on such barbarous type of weapons as chemical ones.

There is yet another, not unimportant aspect of the Soviet programme for nuclear disarmament. It is addressed not only to the United States and other nuclear powers but to all peoples of the world as well. To the Soviet Union, as one of major Asian

powers, the ensurance of security in Asia is of paramount importance. The proposal on the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons is consonant with the sentiments of the peoples of the Asian continent to whom the problem of security is no less keen than to other peoples. Suffice it to recall demands by India and by the other littoral states for making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, for demilitarising the ocean area and for eliminating the U.S. military bases stationed there. The realisation of the Soviet proposals would make it possible basically to change the situation in Asia for the better, would rid the peoples of the continent of fear of nuclear and chemical weapons, would raise security in the region to a qualitatively new level, and would make it more effective. In this sense the Soviet programme is the USSR's contribution to the joint search by Asian states for a comprehensive approach to forming a collective security system in the Asian Continent. The Soviet programme for a nuclear-free world meets the aspirations of all the peoples.

IZVESTIYA Cites Jaruzelski

PM171337 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Very Important Document of the Present Day"]

[Text] Warsaw, 16 Jan -- The bold, constructive initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union serve as a reliable platform for maintaining peace and building the foundations of a secure future for the world, W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council, has said.

Speaking at a meeting with the heads of diplomatic missions accredited to Poland, he stressed that Poland supports any realistic trend in present-day international relations aimed at detente and the consolidation of international security. This approach has had and continues to have fundamental importance for Poland's foreign policy. At the same time Poland is the natural adversary of those forces which want to reverse what is irreversible. The Polish state's foreign policy line is firm and consistent and is aimed at consolidating fraternal allied ties with the socialist community and developing countries.

We are firmly convinced, the speaker noted, that man's salvation from nuclear catastrophe can only be a common matter based on respect for sovereignty and mutual understanding. At the same time the dangers remain for peace and the destiny of all mankind. The arms race is not easing and the threat of its extension to space is becoming a real one. There are local conflicts, a policy of pressure and threats and interference in the internal affairs of peoples and states.

Workers Congress Studies Proposals

LD172118 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 17 Jan 86

[Text] Warsaw, January 17 TASS -- Calls for curbing the arms race and preventing nuclear war are being made from the rostrum of the congress of workers in Science and Culture in Defence of a Peaceful Future of the World, which opened here on Thursday. Touching upon the Soviet Union-proposed programme of full liquidation of nuclear weapons in the world in the next 15 years, president of the Pugwash movement, Nobel Prize Laureate Dorothy Hodgkin has emphasised that scientists are bound to play a major role in the struggle for consolidation of peace.

President of the World Peace Council Romesh Chandra has characterised Mikhail Gorbachev's statement as an exceedingly important initiative aimed at liquidating the nuclear weapons by the year 2000. Romesh Chandra called upon all to comprehensively support the Soviet programme of liquidation of nuclear weapons and said that termination of nuclear weapons tests was now the key issue. The Soviet Union has already declared the extension of the moratorium on tests of nuclear weapons. Thus, one nuclear power now agrees to disarmament. It is necessary to convince other nuclear powers that it is expedient to take such a step.

In his speech head of the Soviet delegation composer Tikhon Khrennikov has said: "Everyone of us becomes increasingly aware that the destinies of peace are now decided not only by politicians and military men. Each person can and even must participate in their decision. And this perhaps particularly concerns workers in science and culture.

Touching upon the idea of establishing an international public centre to combat moral terrorism, to protect the mainstays of civilisation, mankind's moral values, to protect culture from contamination with "Cold War" venom, he said: "In the long run such an organisation could elaborate quite definite norms that would promote internationalist cultural exchange and hamper imperialist expansion in culture."

Tikhon Khrennikov has emphasised that now there is no reasonable alternative to the principle of peaceful coexistence: "In the Soviet Union this is realised by all," he said.

The congress is receiving messages from statesmen and politicians. Messages were sent by U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar, UNESCO General Director Amadou Mahtar M'bow, leaders of Argentina, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, GDR, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Vietnam, other countries.

Honecker Praises Program

LD181333 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 17 Jan 86

[Text] Berlin, January 17 TASS -- A program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, formulated in a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, offers an historic chance to achieve a turn for the better in Europe and all over the world, Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and chairman of the Council of State of the GDR, said here today at his meeting with Marian Orzechowski, an alternate member of the Politbureau of the PUWP Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of Poland, who is paying an official visit to the GDR.

The latest Soviet peace initiative, the GDR leader stressed, reflects the Soviet Union's consistent striving to translate into practice the accords formulated in the joint Soviet-American statement in Geneva. As a result of their implementation, mankind would no longer be a hostage to nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Erich Honecker and Marian Orzechowski noted the great importance of strengthening the alliance with the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community in the struggle for the comprehensive strengthening of socialism and peace.

GDR Disarmament Official Cited

LD172338 Moscow TASS in English 2238 GMT 17 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 17 TASS -- The new Soviet initiatives advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement, are of "historic significance", Doctor Harald Rose, the G.D.R.'s permanent representative to the U.N. office and international organisations in Geneva and head of the Republic's delegation to the conference on disarmament, said here today. He told a TASS correspondent that "the Soviet Union has shown a workable way to rid mankind of the threat of a nuclear disaster. The initiatives set an example for the mannerin which the 'spirit of Geneva' can be translated into practical deeds".

We are impressed with the boldness, the logical consistency and the sense of realism pervading the all-embracing programme advanced in an effort to eliminate all nuclear weapons by the year 2000", the G.D.R.'s representative said.

"The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is thoroughly convinced that the fresh Soviet initiatives will have a crucial impact on and give impetus to the Geneva conference on disarmament. They have particular relevance to the task of the conference to formulate international agreements on the cessation of all nuclear weapons testing, on the complete elimination of chemical weapons and on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. It is now up to the other side to demonstrate readiness for accommodation so that the multilateral body charged with negotiating about disarmament may overcome the many years of standstill and make an effective contribution to the maintenance of peace."

Bulgarian Foreign Minister Quoted

LD201521 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 20 Jan 86

[Text] Sofia, January 20 TASS--"The latest statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev is an integral programme for a radical improvement of the international situation," member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Foreign Affairs Minister of Bulgaria Petur Mladenov has declared.

He pointed out in an interview with TASS correspondent Vladimir Abrosimov that the Soviet leader's statement will leave a deep impression on international life. The document is viewed as a peace manifesto. What the USSR suggests is, in fact, a logical continuation and development of its principled peaceful policy. Mikhail Gorbachev's statement contains a complex of new constructive and realistic initiatives with a view to resolving the most important and topical problems of the time--ridding the world of nuclear and chemical weapons in the conditions of the non-militarization of space. The Soviet initiatives are no declaratory statements. These are concrete proposals geared to concrete dates. A step-by step solution of problems within a definite, visible period attests to the sense of political responsibility to peoples all over the world.

Mikhail Gorbachev's statement not only offers an extensive platform for furure actions in the name of peace. It also contains a rather essential element -- the extension of its moratorium on all nuclear blasts, which attests to the unity of words and deeds of the Soviet Union.

The Bulgarian people and government, Petur Mladenov pointed out, express firm support for new Soviet initiatives. Bulgaria will continue to pursue a principled peaceful policy coordinated between all members of the socialist community. "Consistent struggle for implementing proposals for turning the Balkans into a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons, the proposals which are in full accordance with the spirit of the Soviet statement, is our concrete contribution."

Netherlands Stance

LD181331 Moscow TASS in English 1026 GMT 18 Jan 86

[Text] The Hague, January 18 TASS--The Government of the Netherlands approves and supports the Soviet peace proposals advanced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, a Dutch Foreign Ministry spokesman has announced here.

Taking into account the Netherlands' stance on the reduction and ultimate prohibition of all types of nuclear weaponry, he pointed out, the government believes that certain conditions have now been created for the solution of the problem.

Spanish Communist Party

LD181826 Moscow TASS in English 2217 GMT 17 Jan 86

[Text] Madrid, January 17 TASS -- The Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Spain) welcomes the proposals on nuclear disarmament advanced on behalf of the Soviet Union by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The new initiative, says the statement published here, is a programme aimed at the elimination of nuclear arms on earth. It inspires great and concrete hopes for the removal of the threat of nuclear war in Europe and the whole world. It is a fundamental contribution to the easing of international tension.

The Communist Party (Spain) notes with satisfaction the invariable consistency of the Soviet Union's policy of peace confirmed by the entire range of the proposals with which Mikhail Gorbachev came out in the recent months.

The Soviet initiative which opens up new prospects promotes the intensification of the struggle of all peace champions and might become the main obstacle to the arms race, the statement says.

The Communist Party (Spain) urges all Spanish people striving for peace to declare for the holding of a nationwide referndum on the question of Spain's participation in NATO, for Spain's quitting the North Atlantic bloc and for the dismantling of U.S. military bases on the Spanish territory.

U.S. Senators Cited

LD221801 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 22 Jan 86

[Text] Washington January 22 TASS -- By TASS correspondent N. Turkatenko

The first what [as received] American senators and representatives saw in their offices on returning from long holidays were piles of letters and telegrams from individuals and public organizations. According to Congress employees, a vast majority of those who address their messages to the Capitol persistently demand that the Congress, which resumed work on Tuesday, give top-priority attention to questions of war and peace.

On these days, both American press and television extensively discuss the Soviet peace initiatives on the elimination of nuclear weapons, put forward in the January 15 statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, in the USSR Supreme Soviet's address to the U.S. Congress, handed over to Strom Thurmond, president pro tempore of the Senate, by the USSR's ambassador to the United States Anatoliy Dobrynin on January 17, and in the latest declaration by the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Preoccupied as members of Congress might be with domestic problems, like the reduction of the chronic deficit of the federal budget, a whole number of influential senators and representatives already declared that the Soviet proposals would be thoroughly studied at the Congress in the light of the vital need for reaching an early Soviet-American accord on problems of curbing the arms race.

Sen. Thurmond announced that the text of the address from the USSR Supreme Soviet will be distributed among all senators. There are contradictions, sometimes irreconcilable, between the two countries, he said. But there is no goal more important than peace on earth. That is why the road to a constructive dialogue and proposals that may secure peace should always remain open.

The leader of the House Democratic majority, James Wright, highly assessed the Soviet proposals. The attitude towards the proposals, he said, must be most serious. Pointing to the economic difficulties, currently being experienced by the United States, specifically to the fact that the U.S. state debt topped two trillion dollars under the present administration, he stressed that the United States is interested, not less than the Soviet Union, in releasing resources for needs of the civilian economy.

Alongside this approach to the Soviet proposals, there exists or, rather, prevails another, militarist position. It is indicative, however, that bowing to world public pressure, its advocates are trying hard to pretend that they also favour constructive talks with the Soviet Union.

This is graphically manifested in the manoeuvering of the White House which, on the one hand proclaims that the Soviet proposals deserve serious study, while, on the other hand, rejects the call for joining the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts and continues the implementation of its crash programme of "star wars" directed at spreading the arms race into outer space. Time will show whether the White House's position will undergo any change.

One thing is so far clear: the debate on the questions of war and peace, curbing the arms race and improving Soviet-American relations is gaining momentum in the United States. The Congress, the country's supreme legislative body, is to play an important role in the elaboration of the U.S. stance. With the date of the elections slated for November this year approaching, when the senators and representatives who seek re-election are compelled to take into account the mood of the voters, the pitch of the congressional debates on questions of vital importance for the country and the world at large, the intensity of the search for sensible alternatives to the arms race and the policy of confrontation cannot but grow higher.

Australian Foreign Minister

LD181329 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 18 Jan 86

[Text] Canberra, January 18 TASS -- Commenting on the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, William Hayden, Australia's foreign minister, said that Australia welcomes the extension by the Soviet Union of the moratorium on nuclear testing.

He stressed in a statement for the press that Australia's aim remains an agreement on a full ban on nuclear testing, including formal contractual commitments, under which all nuclear testing in all media would be ended for ever. Australia calls for talks on reaching such an agreement.

The plan proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, which provides for total nuclear disarmament by the end of this century, William Hayden pointed out, is of tremendous interest for Australia and will be carefully studied.

Genscher Cited

LD161711 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, January 16 TASS -- The West German News Agency DDP reports today that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomed the new Soviet peace initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. As Minister of Foreign Affairs of the F.R.G. Hans-Dietrich Genscher said today, the Government of the F.R.G. together with its partners in the North Atlantic alliance will carefully study these proposals.

Another round of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms makes it possible to discuss without delay questions related to nuclear arms reduction. The Government of the F.R.G. hopes that these initiatives will assist in making tangible progress at the talks, the DDP report emphasizes.

DKP's Mies on Proposal

LD161754 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, January 16 TASS -- The programme of a total elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide, put forward by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, is a correct, bold and necessary response to the nuclear menace that is looming large over all of mankind, Herbert Mies, chairman of the German Communist Party, has declared in Dusseldorf.

The German Communist Party wholly approves of the Soviet leader's statement which reflects the Soviet Union's peaceful policy, Mies stressed.

The USSR's latest proposals open the way towards improving the international situation, detente and peaceful cooperation between peoples. They fully correspond to the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments, currently under way in Geneva, he said.

German Communists welcome the Soviet proposals also because they meet the demand, expressed by millions of inhabitants of the Federal Republic of Germany, for the removal of all American first-strike nuclear missiles from the country's territory and for the prevention of the militarization of outer space.

The implementation of the Soviet initiatives, noted the chairman of the German Communist Party, would largely facilitate the successful solution of other global problems, such as combatting hunger, diseases and economic backwardness, and the problem of environmental protection.

Lao President Cited

LD200949 Moscow TASS in English 0844 GMT 20 Jan 86

[Text] Vientiane January 20 TASS -- The latest statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev is of vital importance for the destinies of all peoples on earth. It reflects the good will and tireless efforts by the Soviet Union to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and improve the international situation, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, President of Laos Souphanouvong has stressed in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

The Laotian leader stressed the timely and realistic character of the Soviet Union's proposal for a step-by-step reduction and elimination of nuclear armaments by the year 2000, prevention of the militarization of outer space and total destruction of chemical weapons stockpiles. The extension of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing proves the Soviet Union's sincere striving to end the arms race.

The Laotian people, the president said, call on the U.S. government to give a constructive response to the latest Soviet initiatives in the interests of lessening international tension, achieving mutual trust and ensuring a lasting peace on earth. The escalation of the arms race and its spread into outer space may result in the death of civilization.

Mikhail Gorbachev's statement fully coincides with the aspirations of the peoples on earth, is vivid manifestation of the USSR's Leninist peaceful foreign policy, Souphanouvong stressed.

Libyan Support

LD211853 Moscow TASS in English 1824 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Text] Tripoli, January 21 TASS--The Libyan Jamahiriyah strongly supports the new peace initiative of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev which is aimed at ensuring peaceful future for entire humanity through destroying nuclear arms and renunciating the insanity of so-called "star wars", said Muhammad Sharif al-Din al-Fayturi, Libya's secretary for the information and culture.

The Soviet Union's policy, he said in an interview to TASS correspondent Gennadiy Shelenkov, has always been aimed at establishing genuine peace on earth. The main specific feature of Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals is that they are fully in keeping with the will and aspirations of all peoples on earth.

Therefore we are confident that all peace forces will respond to this initiative. The task of the peoples of all states now, also of countries of the third world, is to raise their voice in support of the new peace programme advanced by the Soviet Union, Muhammad Sharif al-Din al-Fayturi said. All the forces of peace and progress must come out by a united front against the supporters of nuclear confrontation--the ruling circles of the United States, Muhammad Sharif al-Din al-Fayturi said.

Libyan External Relations Official

LD201941 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT 20 Jan 86

[Text] Tripoli, January 20 TASS -- The new Soviet peace initiatives, which were put forward by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, is the practical programme of actions aimed at delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe, said Dau Ali Sueydan [spelling as received] deputy secretary of the People's Bureau for External Relations of Libya.

Libyan Jamahiriyah supports these proposals and believes that to comprehensively promote their realisation is the duty of all the states of the world, and specifically, developing countries, Dau Ali Sueydan said in an interview to TASS correspondent Georgiy Shelenkov.

We believe that the package of new Soviet proposals should be brought to the level of the international community so as all peace forces of the world should be able to promote realisation of this concrete programme of ensuring future to the whole of mankind.

Gandhi Terms Statement 'Encouraging'

LD161836 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Text] New Delhi, January 16 TASS -- The latest statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev is very encouraging. "We wholeheartedly hope that the other side will come up with just as positive a response to these proposals," India's Prime Minister Rajiv Ghandhi has declared.

Making a speech at the association of Indian diplomats here today, he stressed that the Soviet union's programme is an alternative to the armament of space. It explores real ways for ridding the earth of nuclear weapons.

Every person on earth should be responsible for the shaping of such public opinion that would not tolerate the presence of nuclear weapons on the planet, the Indian prime minister stressed.

Austrian Communist Party Leader

LD211802 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Text] Vienna, January 21 TASS -- The chairman of the Communist Party of Austria, Franz Muhri, has welcomed the proposals formulated in a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for completely eliminating nuclear weapons on earth by the year 2000 andbanning chemical weapons and the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions for another three months.

Speaking in Vienna, he said the latest important foreign policy initiatives of the USSR bear out the consistently peaceful nature of its foreign policy. Muhri said that the implementation of these proposals is inseparably linked with the non-militarization of outer space.

Italian Communist Praises Proposal

LD202310 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 20 Jan 86

[Text] Rome, January 20 TASS -- "I regard the programme of stage-by-stage nuclear disarmament proposed by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev as extremely important", Lorenzo Gianotti, chief of the section of problems of peace and disarmament of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, one of the leaders of the joint national committee of the struggle for peace and disarmament, told a TASS correspondent. This can promote the successful holding of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, Lorenzo Gianotti said.

The USSR, specifically proposes to eliminate at the first stage U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone, L. Gianotti said. This is a correct measure. The European states must support any initiative that is aimed at the reduction and elimination of medium-range nuclear arms on the continent. "I believe the Italian Government could take, on its part, a step that would promote this trend to disarmament: to freeze the number of U.S. cruise missiles deployed at the NATO base in Comiso, and then to embark on their scaling down."

L. Gianotti declared against the "star wars" plans worked out by the U.S. Administration. The SDI programme, he said, means a new horrible step towards the disastrous arms race. This is why the governments of West European countries must say "no" to this programme, must not join in it in any way. To remove nuclear weapons from the life of humanity, it is necessary to strive for their destruction.

Greek Prime Minister

LD221354 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 22 Jan 86

[Text] Athens, January 22 TASS -- The decision taken by the United States and its political allies to deploy American missiles in Europe has meant a disruption of the military parity on a global scale, Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou said at a gala meeting of the movement for national independence, international peace and disarmament, which was devoted to the U.N.-proclaimed international year of peace.

He said that all East-West talks now under way in the field of disarmament are threatened with U.S. intransigence on the "Strategic Defense Initiative" issue. Washington presents the militarization of outer space as a defense system that would put an end to the nuclear arms race. But the development of such a system in fact would only give a boost to an unrestrained arms race and can ultimately lead to a "nuclear winter".

Andreas Papandreou spoke highly of the proposal by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to eliminate all nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000. It is not just a proposal, but a concrete plan of action covering all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, he said, adding that the Soviet initiative is aimed at protecting life on the planet.

"So the question is in order: Who and for what reason may be against this program of exceptional significance?," Andreas Papandreou said. "We express the wish that Washington study Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal carefully and in good faith. All the world's peoples expect this since the future of civilization on earth will depend in large measure on the U.S. final decision."

Cambodian Statement

LD221504 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 22 Jan 86

[Text] Phnom Penh, January 22 TASS -- The new Soviet initiatives on disarmament have been fully supported by the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. In the statement which was issued in Phnom Penh it is noted that peace is particularly treasured by the Kampuchean people who lost millions of its sons and daughters in the years of imperialist aggression against countries of Indochina to be the target of an undeclared war which is conducted by imperialism and reactionary forces. The Kampucheans see in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement the source of inspiration and hope for a peaceful future. These initiatives testify to the sincere peaceability of the Soviet Union, its goodwill, realism and constructive stand. The Kampuchean people in close alliance with the fraternal peoples of Vietman and Laos is fully determined to make a befitting contribution to safegrarding peace and stability in South East Asia, thereby promoting the cause of workd peace, the statement stresses.

Sweden's Palme

PM211301 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Dispatch by unnamed own correspondent: "Work Completed"]

[Text] Delhi, 20 Jan -- The 3-day session of the independent commission on disarmament and security, also known as the Palme commission, has completed its work here. The session, in which political and public figures from various countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, including Soviet representatives, took part, examined questions of curbing the nuclear arms race and enhancing the role of the United Nations and problems of regional security. At the concluding press conference, Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, the chairman of the independent commission, noted that its sessions have taken place under the influence of the Soviet Union's recent proposals, which he called very important and far-sighted.

The final document of the commission's sessions says: "The commission welcomes the important statement made by General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev 15 January 1986 which presented a three-stage program for abolishing nuclear armaments by the year 2000. This farreaching and constructive statement, in the commission's opinion, should attract the most ardent attention. The commission urges both sides (the USSR and the United States) to reach an agreement in the very near future on specific steps with a view to halting the nuclear arms race."

Calling for the speediest attainment of an agreement on the total cessation of nuclear explosions, the commission believes that there are now no technical obstacles on the path of the implementation of verification of the observance of such agreements.

The United States and the Soviet Union, the statement notes, must reach an agreement in the very near future banning the development [razrabotka], testing, and deployment of armaments in space. It is in the spirit of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement or in a formulation close to it that the commission examines other problems concerning banning or reducing chemical weapons, conventional armaments, and armed forces in Central Europe and the tasks of the talks under way on these questions in Geneva and Vienna.

Bulgarian Official Lauds Initiative

LD181235 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT 17 Jan 86

[Text] Warsaw, January 17 TASS -- "Now at the end of the 20th century, humanity is nearer to perishing than ever. This threat is created by the continued arms race, the "star wars" plans, the manufacture of new horrifying weapons of mass annihilation", said president of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Angel Balevsky, who heads the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria at the congress of workers in science and culturein defence of the globe's peaceful future, under way here.

In an interview to TASS correspondent Andrey Pershin he stressed that the time factor has become decisive now. If the arms race is not stopped now, this will be impossible to do in the next decade, when no force will be able to stem the unrestrained buildup of the arsenals of deadly weapons.

A large-scale complex of constructive initiatives advanced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev is aimed at a cardinal solution of this burning problem. These initiatives give hope to all people of goodwill that mankind's greatest asset, peace, will be preserved, the academician said.

He pointed to a special role of scientists in the peace movement. The responsibility of scientists for the destinies of the globe must be manifested not in abstract formulas but in concrete deeds. The aim of the Warsaw congress is precisely to discuss and outline the programme of such deeds.

"A powerful vivifying impetus is given to this by Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, his constructive proposals which offer a real alternative to nuclear catastrophe and a concrete way for preventing it", Angel Balevsky said.

SRV's Pham Van Dong

LD162221 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Text] Hanoi January 16 TASS -- The comprehensive constructive programme of delivering the world from nuclear and chemical weapons set forth in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev opens up a remarkable opportunity for mankind's age-old dream to come true -- durable and reliable peace on earth, said Pham Van Dong, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The new Soviet comprehensive peace proposals, he stressed in an interview to a TASS correspondent, demonstrate once again the USSR's high responsibility for the destinies of the living and would-be generations. The decision to prolong the term of the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions provides striking evidence of the noble stand of the Soviet Union, its invariable goodwill. The Soviet leader's call to do away with the nuclear threat finds very broad response among all strata of the international public. It has become a new efficient impetus for invigoration of the struggle of all anti-war forces for peace and life, for the bright ideals of peaceful coexistence.

That very important document is of historical significance. The Vietnamese people fully support the Soviet Union-proposed realistic peace programme of struggle for all-embracing elimination of nuclear and chemical armaments, for prevention of their placement whatsoever in outer space. We, just as all progressive forces in the world, call upon the United States and other nuclear powers to follow the USSR's example, to join the Soviet initiatives and to jointly advance towards full nuclear disarmament, towards consolidation of peace and security of the peoples, stressed Pham Van Dong.

SRV's Nguyen Huu Tho

PM210916 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent M. Domogatskikh report on interview with Nguyen Huu Tho, chairman of the SRV National Assembly and winner of the Lenin Peace Prize: "An All-Embracing Document"]

[Text] Hanoi, 17 Jan--The statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is an all-embracing peace program.

The new Soviet proposals are an embodiment of the innermost aspirations of all peoples on the planet and are encountering the warmest response among them, Nguyen Huu Tho, chairman of the SRV National Assembly and winner of the Lenin Peace Prize, said in an interview for PRAVDA.

Mankind must enter the new millennium without fear for the life of future generations and for the very existence of civilization. This is the goal of the specific action program proposed by the Soviet leader. Its realism is determined by the fact that it fully corresponds with the spirit of the USSR-U.S. Geneva Summit meeting and takes into account the interests of all sides. The new Soviet initiatives are evidence of a lofty sense of responsibility for the fate of peace. The 3-month extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions is a step of enormous political daring and importance. It demonstrates the invariable goodwill of the Land of the Soviets. The Vietnamese people perceive M.S. Gorbachev's statement as a vivid confirmation of the USSR's consistent and peace-loving foreign policy line. Totally supporting the new constructive peace initiatives of the Land of the Soviets, we expect that the United States and its allies will display political common sense and responsibility in the present extremely complex international situation.

SRV State Council Chairman

LD211514 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Text] Hanoi, January 21 TASS -- The comprehensive programme of nuclear disarmament, which was put forward in a statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, has been qualified as a great peace initiative by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, Chairman of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Truong Chinh.

Receiving today the USSR ambassador in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Truong Chinh has noted that in the past four decades mankind has been living under the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. This period has been marked with acute struggle between the United States, other imperialist forces, whipping up the arms race, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, and all the forces of peace and progress, on the other hand. True as it is to its foreign policy course, the USSR repeatedly put forward large-scale initiatives aimed at improving the international situation. A whole package of realistic and constructive proposals has been made in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, which testifies to the USSR's high responsibility for the destinies of mankind, for security of the living and would-be generations.

"The initiatives which were put forward by general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee give us the hope for a world with no nuclear weapons, for mankind's deliverance for all time from the threat of nuclear destruction. Those initiatives inspire the peoples of the whole planet for stepped up struggle for peace and security. Mikhail Gorbachev's statement accords with the vital interests and aspirations of the peoples of Asia and the whole world, and the lofty aims set in it accord with the aims of peaceful aspirations of all peoples," said Truong Chinh.

"At one with the whole of progressive mankind," stressed Truong Chinh, "the Vietnamese people fully supports Mikhail Gorbachev's statement and the proposals made in it. We are fully determined to continue making an active contribution to the struggle for peace and security, against nuclear threat."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1234

PRESS CONFERENCE HELD TO DISCUSS GORBACHEV'S PROPOSAL

PRAVDA Report

PM201600 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held in Moscow on 18 January in connection with the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on questions of the limitation of the arms race and disarmament. It was given by G.M. Korniyenko, USSR first deputy foreign minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the Armed Forces General Staff; and L.M. Zamyatin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Section.

Opening the press conference, L.M. Zamyatin said:

[Uppercase passages in the following item were not published in this PRAVDA, item but were carried in a Moscow TASS in English report on Zamyatin's statement at 1934 GMT on 18 Jan.]

The statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, outlined a concrete and detailed plan of purposeful actions to remove the most serious threat now hanging over mankind -- the danger of nuclear war.

The program of totally liquidating nuclear arms in the entire world during the next 15 years is the core of the new large-scale set of Soviet peace initiatives. THE SOVIET UNION HAS PROPOSED TO IMPLEMENT AND CONCLUDE THE PROCESS OF RIDDING THE EARTH OF NUCLEAR ARMS BY THE END OF THE PRESENT CENTURY.

THE PROGRAMME PROPOSED BY THE SOVIET UNION PROVIDES FOR A STAGE-BY-STAGE REDUCTION OF NUCLEAR ARMS -- BOTH DELIVERY VEHICLES AND MUNITIONS -- RIGHT TO THEIR TOTAL LIQUIDATION UNDER APPROPRIATE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL IN CONDITIONS OF A BAN ON THE DEVELOPMENT, TESTING AND DEPLOYMENT OF SPACE STRIKE ARMS. The concrete proposals outlined in the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee open a realistic road to ensuring a fundamental breakthrough in the international arena. The Soviet initiative outlines clear-cut routes and reference points, suggests a concrete time frame for reaching accords and fulfilling them, and is capable of making the talks on these matters pusposeful and goal-oriented.

The Soviet proposals to fully liquidate nuclear arms are addressed, first of all, to the United States. It is precisely the Soviet Union and the United States that should set an example for other nuclear powers at the first stage of nuclear disarmament and already at this stage, in the course of 5-8 years should reduce nuclear arms reaching each other's territory by one-half, liquidate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe as the first step toward ridding the European Continent of nuclear arms, and stop all nuclear explosions. This initiative by the Soviet leadership fully accords with the Geneva agreement between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. At the same time, the Soviet proposals also presuppose the inclusion of all other nuclear powers in this process at its subsequent stages. SINCE THE POINT IN QUESTION IS A PROBLEM OF IMPORTANCE TO THE WHOLE OF MANKIND THAT CAN AND MUST BE SOLVED ONLY JOINTLY.

A ban on the deployment of strike weapons in outer space should become a natural and logical precondition to the liquidation of nuclear arms. To prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space means to remove the barrier to profound reductions of nuclear arms.

IT IS A PEACEFUL OUTER SPACE AND NOT "STAR WARS" THAT IS THE ONLY REAL ROAD TO MAKING NUCLEAR ARMS UNNECESSARY TO REDUCING THEM TO ZERO.

The blocking of all channels toward perfecting nuclear arms, of the possibilities to create [sozdaniye] ever more sophisticated and lethal varieties of these arms is an inalienable part of the process of reducing and liquidating nuclear arms. Guiding itself by this approach and as a manifestation of goodwill, the Soviet Union has decided to prolong by three months the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts announced by it in August 1985. The Soviet Union again offers the United States the opportunity to join this most important and constructive Soviet step.

The program of nuclear disarmament also provides for a ban on the development [sozdaniye] of non-nuclear arms based on new physical principles, which by their destructive power approach weapons of mass annihilation.

The Soviet Union proposes removing chemical weapons from the arsenals of states during the next few years. It comes out for destroying their stockpiles and for the speediest liquidation of the actual industrial base for the manufacture of these weapons under strict control, including international on-site verification.

We propose to put the entire existing system of negotiations into action to implement the program of reducing and liquidating nuclear arms, averting an arms race in outer space, banning chemical weapons, reducing armed forces and conventional armaments, and strengthening confidence-building measures. These are the talks in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm.

Mikhail Gorbachev's statement is widely supported by the world public and has evoked considerable interest among political circles and statesmen in various countries.

The Soviet people actively and ardently support the position of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. MIKHAIL GORBACHEV'S STATEMENT IS A TOPICAL AND SCOPEFUL DOCUMENT. IT SHOWS THAT SUCH FAR-REACHING PROPOSALS ON THE TOTAL LIQUIDATION OF NUCLEAR ARMS COULD BE WORKED OUT AND SUBMITTED ONLY BY A STATE THAT IS FIRMLY RESOLVED TO PREVENT NUCLEAR WAR. THIS LINE IS DETERMINED BY OUR SOCIAL SYSTEM, OUR MORALS AND WORLD OUTLOOK. OUR PARTY IS NOW ADVANCING TOWARDS ITS 27TH CONGRESS FIRMLY HOLDING THE INITIATIVE IN MATTERS OF PRESERVING PEACE ON EARTH.

It is hoped in the Soviet Union that the new far-reaching Soviet initiatives will be assessed abroad on merit, first of all in the leading circles of the United States and other Western powers. A POSITIVE RESPONSE OF THE WEST TO THE SOVIET PROPOSALS WOULD MAKE IT POSSIBLE, AT LONG LAST, TO MOVE OFF DEAD CENTRE THE PROCESS OF SOLVING THE MOST URGENT AND PRESSING PROBLEM OF OUR TIME -- THAT OF REMOVING THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR, OF LIMITING AND STOPPING THE PROCESS OF MANUFACTURING AND STOCKPILING LETHAL WEAPONS OF THE MASS ANNIHILATION OF PEOPLE.

The participants in the press conference then answered numerous questions from correspondents: [Uppercase passages in the following paragraphs were not published in this PRAVDA report, but were carried in a Moscow TASS International Service in Russian report on the question and answer portion of the press conference at 1558 GMT on 18 Jan.]

Question: It is well-known that the Soviet Union has come out before in favor of a radical reduction in, and the ultimate complete liquidation of all nuclear weapons. Could you please go into detail about how the current Soviet proposals differ from the previous ones in this regard?

Answer: The banning and ultimate complete liquidation of nuclear weapons has in fact always been the aim of Soviet foreign policy.

Now, however, the Soviet Union has put forward a concrete program for achieving this noble and great aim, not some time in the vague, remote future, but within an historically brief period of time -- just 15 years -- on the condition, of course, that space strike weapons are also banned. It is in this -- its concrete nature -- that the fundamental novelty and significance of our initiative lies.

Question: Does the new Soviet initiative envisage that both nuclear weapon carriers and the nuclear charges for them will be destroyed? How will this be carried out in practice?

Answer: According to the Soviet program, both nuclear weapon carriers and the nuclear charges for them must be subject to destruction. First and foremost, this goes for strategic and medium-range means. Certain tactical nuclear weapons carriers, such as those with a range of less than 1,000 km, could be made subject to reequipping so they would be unable to fulfill the function of nuclear weapons carriers. How could this be carried out in practice? What would probably be required is the development [razrabotka] of sophisticated special procedures for destroying nuclear ammunition and for the dismantling, reequipping, or destruction of the carriers. At all stages in the elimination of nuclear weapons, the amount of weapons to be destroyed and the locations where they would be destroyed must be agreed on. There must, of course, be reliable monitoring, including international monitoring, of the destruction or reequipping of weapons.

Question: In the statement made by U.S. President Reagan on the day that the new round of negotiations began in Geneva, there is no mention of space weapons. This gives rise to the question of whether the Soviet-U.S. accord achieved in Geneva on the interlinked resolution of questions pertaining to nuclear and space weapons is still in force.

Answer: We firmly proceed from that. M.S. Gorbachev's statement makes it absolutely clear that the reduction and subsequent liquidation of nuclear weapons are possible only if the Soviet Union and the United States both repudiate the creation [sozdaniye],

testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space-based strike weapons. This is no arbitrary linking of two different questions. No, it is a matter of their objective, organic, and material interconnection, which cannot be separated.

Question: A number of speeches made by U.S. leaders say that, in recent years, the United States has repeatedly called for the world to be free of nuclear weapons. What is more, referring back to relevant presidential statements made in 1981 and 1983, they claim the Soviet Union's new initiative does not change anything.

Answer: True enough. Such pronouncements have been made by White House representatives at different levels. The point must be made, however, that the U.S. presidential statements in question were made in a general way and contained nothing concrete, certainly no plan or program. They were just wishes. Now, however, the Soviet Union is proposing a concrete plan of action.

WE PROCEED FROM THE VIEW THAT THE TIME HAS COME TO ADOPT PRACTICAL MEASURES AIMED AT COMPLETELY AND UNIVERSALLY LIQUIDATING NUCLEAR WEAPONS DURING THE NEXT 15 YEARS.

Question: As is known, the main obstacle in the way of an accord in Vienna is the problem of monitoring. What kind of monitoring, specifically over a troop and arms reduction as well as a nonincrease in their levels, does the Soviet Union envisage?

Answer: In the program the Soviet Union has currently set out, it states perfectly clearly that it favors effective monitoring in all fields of the reduction and limitation of armaments and of disarmament.

At the same time, monitoring must be in accordance with the extent and nature of the commitments undertaken by the countries.

At the Vienna talks, the Soviet Union envisages adequate measures of monitoring both on troop and arms reductions and on a nonincrease in the levels of armed forces. Apart from national technical means of control, we also envisage such measures as an exchange of lists of troop units that are to be reduced, mutual notification about the beginning and the completion of the reduction, and the creation by each side -- for the period of the withdrawal -- of three to four points for observation of the troop withdrawal. We believe these measures ensure reliable monitoring of the fulfillment of the agreement.

The program also envisages the establishment on a permanent basis of operational points for monitoring the entry into (withdrawal from) the reduction zone of troop contingents.

Question: How does the new Soviet proposal for a stage-by-stage liquidation of nuclear weapons harmonize with the Soviet side's position on the Geneva talks, in particular with the proposal on the 50-percent reduction of nuclear armaments?

Answer: The program we have proposed for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons on the condition of a similar, complete ban on space strike armaments has been formulated in such a way that all that we proposed at the Geneva talks is organically written into it. This also applies to the 50-percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. nuclear armaments which can reach each other's territory. Such a reduction would take place during the first and partly during the second stage of the implementation of the program.

Question: M.S. Gorbachev's proposal talks about eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe in the first stage, while British and French missiles remain in place until the second stage. Is this not a change in the previous Soviet stance or a movement of this stance closer to Ronald Reagan's zero option proposal?

Answer: First, the Soviet proposal has nothing in common with Reagan's "zero option." On the one hand, the "zero," according to Reagan, envisaged that the Soviet Union would be obliged to destroy its medium-range missiles not only in the European zone but also in the east of the country; while, on the other hand, it did not rule out either the United States being able to transfer such missiles to its allies or Britain and France being able to build up their own corresponding nuclear arms. As you can see, this is not at all what we are proposing.

Second, the new Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles is, of course, a big and bold step on the path to freeing the European Continent of nuclear arms. NOW, WHEN THE SOVIET UNION HAS EXPRESSED A WILLINGNESS TO ELIMINATE ALL OF ITS MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILES HERE ON THE CONDITION THAT THE UNITED STATES ELIMINATE SIMILAR MISSILES, EVEN THE EUROPEANS WHO WERE INTIMIDATED BY THE SOVIET SS-20 MISSILES WILL BE ABLE TO HAVE THEIR OWN WEIGHTY SAY AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY WANT TO HAVE U.S. MISSILES IN THEIR HOME.

Question: President R. Reagan said that M.S. Gorbachev's proposal is constructive and one might think that one the whole, U.S. reaction to it is warm. Why then are you appraising the U.S. standpoint negatively with regard to the Soviet initiatives?

Answer: We are not appraising U.S. reaction completely negatively. We are only saying that, together with the statements welcoming the Soviet initiatives, particular sections are immediately putting forward problems that to all intents and purposes act as a brake in the practical solution of the issues we have posed.

Take, for instance, the statement that was just made by C. Weinberger, the U.S. defense secretary, to the effect that there will be no changes in the U.S. position regarding the SDI program. Weinberger also claimed that the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on nuclear explosions is unacceptable to the U.S. side because at this stage, the Soviet Union has allegedly carried out more explosions than the United States. This is, however, simply incorrect. For instance, according to data of the Stockholm Institute of Peace Problems, by the beginning of 1985 the United States had carried out 772 nuclear explosions, while the Soviet Union had carried out 556. During the Soviet moratorium, the gap in favor of the U.S. increased still further.

Question: What are the conditions and time scale for joining the program and process of nuclear disarmament by the remaining nuclear states?

Answer: As is known, leaders of Great Britain, France, and China have repeatedly declared that these countries will be ready to join the process of nuclear disarmament when the Soviet Union and the United States substantially reduce their nuclear arsenals.

Taking this into account, we propose these countries begin reducing their nuclear armaments in the second stage, after the Soviet Union and the United States have reduced -- not simply significantly, but by a factor of two -- their strategic and other nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory. Additionally, according to our proposal, reduction of the nuclear arsenals of these countries would start with the destruction of tactical weapons; those nuclear armaments, which they themselves call strategic, would be destroyed only in the third stage, simultaneously with the completion of the elimination of the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals.

On the whole, our program has been drawn up so that its implementation would not even inflict damage to anyone's security in any single stage. EVERYTHING IN IT IS BALANCED.

QUESTION: U.S. PRESS AND, IN PARTICULAR, THE INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE IN ITS 13 JANUARY ISSUE REPORTED THAT THE WEAPONS BEING DEVELOPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SDI PROGRAM ARE ALSO INTENDED FOR USE AS OFFENSIVE WEAPONS. COULD YOU COMMENT ON THESE REPORTS?

ANSWER: TRUE. FOR EXAMPLE, SUCH WEAPONS AS THE LASER WEAPON IN SPACE COULD DESTROY NOT ONLY ENEMY WARHEADS, BUT GROUND-BASED OBJECTS AND EVEN ENTIRE CITIES.

WE ARE AGAINST THE DEPLOYMENT OF STRIKE WEAPONS, INCLUDING LASER ONES, IN SPACE. WHAT THEY CALL THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE IS, IN FACT, THE DEPLOYMENT OF STRIKE WEAPONS IN SPACE. THAT IS PRECISELY WHY THE INITIAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION ON BANNING SPACE STRIKE WEAPONS SHOULD BECOME, AT THE SECOND STAGE OF THE NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT PROGRAM, A MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT WITH THE PARTICIPATION OF ALL LEADING INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES.

Question: How, specifically, is the question of the elimination of the medium-range missiles dealt with in the three-stage Soviet program?

Answer: The program very specifically deals with freeing Europe from nuclear weapons. As a first, radical step in this direction we propose to eliminate, as early as the first stage, all Soviet and U.S. ballistic and cruise medium-range missiles in the European zone. This will be possible if the United States commits itself to not supply its medium-range strategic missiles to other countries and Britain and France to not build up the corresponding nuclear weapons.

Question: What did M.S. Gorbachev have in mind when he spoke of non-nuclear weapons, based upon new physical principles, which come close to nuclear weapons in their destructive capabilities? Has the Soviet Union carried out development [razrabotka] and testing of weapons of this kind to a degree necessary for their deployment?

Answer: Weapons based on new physical principles would include, among others, means using physical principles never before used to hit personnel, military equipment, and targets. Among weapons of this kind, one might include ray, radio wave, infrasonic [infrazvukovoy], geophysical, and genetic weapons. In their strike characteristics, these types of weapons might be no less dangerous than mass strike weapons.

The Soviet Union considers it necessary to establish a ban on the development [sozdaniye] of armaments of this kind. The Soviet Union has not carried out, nor does it intend to carry out, either tests of such armaments, or -- even less so -- the deployment of them. It will seek to ensure that all other countries also do not do so.

Question: I would like you to say something about new elements in the Soviet stance on banning chemical weapons. What, in your opinion, is hindering the completion of the elaboration of an international convention on the banning of chemical weapons?

Answer: The Soviet Union favors a very speedy and complete liquidation of chemical weapons and the industrial basis of their manufacture. We are prepared to come to an agreement concerning the timely announcement of the location of plants producing chemical weapons, the halt of chemical weapons production, and the start of liquidating chemical weapons stocks soon after the convention goes into effect. All of this and the destruction of the industrial basis should be carried out under strict control, including international on-site checks. OUR PROPOSAL ON THE NONTRANSFER OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS TO ANYONE AND THE NONSITING OF THEM IN OTHER STATES' TERRITORY IS ALSO KNOWN TO YOU.

IN OTHER WORDS, WE ARE PROPOSING TO GENUINELY CONCERN OURSELVES WITH PRECISELY THOSE PROBLEMS ON WHICH PROGRESS AT THE TALKS ON BANNING CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEPENDS.

The elaboration of a convention has been at a standstill first and foremost, in view of the absence of political will from the United States and its NATO allies. [TO GO FOR A RADICAL SOLUTION OF THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS PROBLEM -- A FULL BAN ON THEM AND THE DESTRUCTION OF STOCKS AND THE VERY BASE OF THEIR PRODUCTION.

This is borne out both by their stance on this issue at the Geneva disarmament conference and by the fact that the United States, since a new administration came to power in 1980, has in general broken off bilateral talks with the USSR. THAT WERE BEING CONDUCTED PREVIOUSLY, AND UNSUCCESSFULLY, WITH THE AIM OF FINDING MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS ON KEY PROVISIONS OF THE CONVENTION.

ONE WOULD LIKE TO HOPE THAT SINCE THE SIDES AGREED DURING THE SOVIET-U.S. SUMMIT MEETING IN GENEVA TO STEP UP EFFORTS ON THE CONCLUSION OF AN EFFECTIVE AND VERIFIABLE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE BANNING AND DESTRUCTION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS, THE UNITED STATES WILL CORRESPONDINGLY ADJUST ITS STANCE. THE SOVIET UNION WILL NOT BE FOUND WANTING.

QUESTION: THIS IS A SOMEWHAT FUTURISTIC QUESTION. WHAT SORT OF PICTURE DOES THE SOVIET UNION HAVE OF THE WORLD [or peace -- Russian is "mir"] IN THE 21ST CENTURY IN THE EVENT THE PROPOSED PROGRAM IS PUT INTO PRACTICE?

ANSWER: THIS IS A QUESTION BOTH FUTURISTIC AND REALISTIC. THE ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR AND CHEMICAL WEAPONS AND THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WOULD YIELD AN ENORMOUS ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE TO ALL STATES OF THE WORLD. FIRST AND FOREMOST, THE DEBT NOOSE OF TRILLIONS WHICH IS STRANGLING TENS OF COUNTRIES AND WHOLE CONTINENTS WILL BE REMOVED. ENORMOUS SUMS COULD BE TRANSFERRED INTO SOLVING SOCIAL QUESTIONS AND THE MANY COMMON HUMAN PROBLEMS: ELIMINATING HUNGER AND DISEASE AND CONSERVING THE ENVIRONMENT.

WE HOPE THAT IN THE THIRD MILLENIUM THE WORLD WILL LIVE WITHOUT WEAPONS AND WITHOUT WARS SO THAT MANKIND CAN DEVOTE ITSELF TO CREATIVE LABOR.

QUESTION: IN THE WEST THEY ARE OF THE OPINION THAT LAND FORCES REPRESENT A THREAT TO EUROPEAN SECURITY. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCUSSION AT ALL AT THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE ABOUT GIVING NOTIFICATION OF AIR FORCE AND NAVAL EXERCISES?

ANSWER: IT WOULD BE WRONG TO SAY THAT, BECAUSE IT IS NOT ONLY LAND FORCES THAT TAKE PART IN MILITARY ACTIVITY, BUT ALSO OTHER TYPES OF ARMED FORCES AND BRANCHES OF FORCES. HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE AND THE EXPERIENCE OF MODERN WARS AND CONFLICTS GRAPHICALLY SHOW THE GREAT AND OFTEN DECISIVE IMPORTANCE THAT THE AIR FORCE AND NAVY HAVE HAD IN COMBAT ACTION AND THE GREAT DAMAGE THEY HAVE DONE USING EVEN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.

TAKING THIS INTO ACCOUNT, IT IS ILLOGICAL AND UNJUSTIFIABLE TO SINGLE OUT JUST ONE TYPE, FOR EXAMPLE LAND FORCES, AT THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE OUT OF THE ENTIRE BROAD SPECTRUM OF MILITARY ACTIVITY BY ARMED FORCES THAT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANDATE OF THE CONFERENCE, IS TO BE COVERED BY CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES. THE ACTIVITY OF THE AIR FORCE AND NAVY MUST THEREFORE, OF COURSE, FROM A CERTAIN LEVEL UPWARDS, BE COVERED BY SUCH NOTIFICATION MEASURES.

Question: Nevertheless, the question over your SS-20 missiles is not quite clear. In the opinion of NATO, there is no difference between the missiles deployed in Europe and those deployed in Asia because of their mobility. What could you say on this question?

Answer: That question is not a new one. We have already said that the SS-20 missiles have been deployed in Europe because the NATO countries have corresponding medium-range nuclear means that represent a threat to the security of the Soviet Union. As far as the SS-20 missiles in the east of our country are concerned, they are deployed there primarily because the United States has its own nuclear means in that region that are capable of reaching the territory of the Soviet Union. These include carrier-based aircraft and nuclear-capable aircraft based in Misawa on Hokkaido Island.

Now let us consider the mobility of the missiles. White House Deputy Press Secretary Speakes has said, you see, that, even if the SS-20 missiles in Europe are destroyed, it makes no difference, because only a few weeks are needed to transfer the missiles from the east. First, however, they are not in the east in order to be shifted backward and forward. Second, one can put to Speakes the question: How long does it take to transfer Pershing missiles from the United States to Europe? AND THAT IS NOT A THEORETICAL QUESTION... [TASS ellipsis]

BY THE WAY, ON THE SUBJECT OF PERSHING MISSILES, ALTHOUGH 108 LAUNCHERS ARE SITED IN EUROPE, THREE TIMES AS MANY OF THE ACTUAL MISSILES HAVE BEEN ORDERED AND FAR MORE HAVE ALREADY BEEN MANUFACTURED THAN ARE SITED IN EUROPE. FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW, THEN, IT IS LEGITIMATE TO ASK IF, IN FACT, WE CAN DESTROY THE MISSILES IN THE EUROPEAN PART, SINCE ADDITIONAL MISSILES MAY BE TRANSFERRED FROM THE UNITED STATES -- AND IN ONLY A FEW DAYS.

Several excuses of all kinds can be found if you do not want to solve a problem. Under the pretense of the so-called global approach to medium-range missiles, the United States would simply like to prevent any accord. Our program, however, also solves the problem of the medium-range missiles, including those in the east. In 15 years, there would be no missiles at all.

Question: IT IS KNOWN THAT ALL PREVIOUS ARMS LIMITATION TALKS HAVE BEEN PROLONGED. In this connection, do you believe implementation of a program to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000 is realistic?

Answer: THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP FULLY APPRECIATES THE DIFFICULTY OF THE TASK OF SEEKING THE SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS REQUIRED TO COMPLETELY FREE THE WORLD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS. HOWEVER, THEY ALSO FULLY REALIZE THAT THE SITUATION TAKING SHAPE IN THE WORLD, OR -- IF YOU WILL -- HISTORY, GRANTS ALL OF US AN EXTREMELY SHORT TIME IN WHICH TO FIND SUCH SOLUTIONS. IT HAS ALREADY BEEN STRESSED SEVERAL TIMES -- AND M.S. GORBACHEV HAS SPOKEN OF THIS MORE THAN ONCE, INCLUDING IN HIS CONVERSATIONS WITH R. REAGAN -- THAT THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION IS TOO COMPLEX AND TOO DANGEROUS FOR ANY DELAY TO BE PERMITTED IN RESOLVING PROBLEMS UPON WHICH MANKIND'S SURVIVAL DEPENDS; TOMORROW THE SITUATION MAY BECOME EVEN MORE COMPLEX AND DANGEROUS. The answer to your question is this: Yes, we believe the world can be rid of the threat of nuclear disaster; the

world can be rid of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. For this, all those upon whom the resolution of the problems indicated depends must demonstrate an understanding of the responsibility they bear and show the political will. AND READINESS TO EMBARK WITHOUT DELAY ON THE QUEST FOR PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS TO QUESTIONS OF NUCLEAR, SPACE, AND OTHER ARMAMENTS.

Replies were also given to other questions.

'Vremya' Coverage

LD190030 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1525 GMT 18 Jan 86

[Press conference held in Moscow 18 January for Soviet and foreign journalists in connection with the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on questions of limiting the arms race and disarmament. Participating in the conference are Comrade Korniyenko, first deputy USSR foreign minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces and first deputy USSR defense minister; and Comrade Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee -- recorded]

[Text] [Zamyatin] The statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU, outlines a concrete and detained plan of purposeful actions to completely eliminate the most serious threat now hanging over mankind -- the danger of nuclear war.

The program of totally liquidating nuclear weapons throughout the entire world during the coming 15 years is the core of the new large-scale set of Soviet peace initiatives. The Soviet Union has proposed implementing and concluding the process of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century.

The program proposed by the Soviet Union provides for a stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear weapons -- both delivery vehicles and warheads -- right up to their total liquidation under appropriate international control and with an accord banning the development, testing, and deployment of space strike arms.

The concrete proposals set out in the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee open a realistic road to ensuring a fundamental breakthrough in the international arena.

We have tried on this diagram here, [diagram follows report] as far as we have been able, to present the graphic stages in the reduction of nuclear armaments and the contents of each stage; therefore, in our replies to questions we ask you to bear this diagram, which we have before us here, in mind.

Now, allow us to answer your questions.

[Kalyagin] Kalyagin, Central Television. My question is for Comrade Korniyenko. It is well known that the Soviet Union came out earlier in favor of a radical reduction in, and ultimately, the complete liquidation of, all nuclear weapons. Could you please go into detail about how the current Soviet proposals differ from the previous ones in this regard?

[Korniyenko] The banning and ultimately, the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons, in fact, has always been the aim of Soviet foreign policy. Now, however, the Soviet Union has put forward a concrete program, worked out in detail, for achieving this

noble and truly great aim and not some time in the vague future, but within a historically brief period of time -- just 15 years -- on the condition, of course, that space strike weapons are also banned. It is in this -- its concrete nature -- that the fundamental novelty and significance of our initiative lies.

[Zamyatin] A question for Comrade Akhromeyev. Does the new Soviet initiative envisage that both nuclear weapon carriers and the nuclear charges for them will be eliminated? How will this be carried out in practice?

[Akhromeyev] In accordance with the Soviet program, both nuclear weapon carriers and the nuclear charges for them are to be eliminated. First and foremost, this goes for strategic and medium-range systems. Here, apparently, no exceptions should be permitted. Certain tactical nuclear weapons carriers, that is, with a range of less than 1,000 km, could be made subject to reequipping so that they would be unable to fulfill the function of nuclear weapon carriers. How could this be carried out in practice? What would be required is the development probably of sophisticated special procedures for eliminating nuclear munitions and the dismantling, reequipping, or elimination of the carriers. At all stages in the elimination of nuclear weapons, the amount of weapons to be destroyed and the locations where they will be destroyed must be agreed. The program envisages that there must, of course, be reliable monitoring, including international monitoring, of the destruction or reequipping of weapons.

[Zamyatin] A question for Comrade Korniyenko. It is put by (Keith Clarke), MORNING STAR correspondent. Can it be considered that the accord achieved in November in Geneva on the interlinked resolution of questions pertaining to nuclear and space weapons is still in force?

[Korniyenko] We firmly proceed from that. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement makes it absolutely clear that the reduction and subsequent liquidation of nuclear weapons are possible only if the Soviet Union and the United States both repudiate the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space-based strike weapons. This is no arbitrary linking of two different questions. No, it is a matter of their objective, organic, and material interconnection which cannot be sundered by anyone or anything. That is our reply to that question.

[Zamyatin] TASS correspondent Velikhov asks: A number of speeches made by U.S. leaders say that in recent years the United States has repeatedly called for the world to be freed from nuclear weapons. What is more, referring back to relevant presidential statements made in 1981 and 1983, they claim the Soviet Union's new initiative does not change anything. True enough. Such pronouncements are made by White House representatives at different levels. The point must be made, however, that the U.S. presidential statements in question were made in a general way and contained nothing concrete and certainly, no plan or program. They were just wishes. But now the Soviet Union is proposing a concrete plan of action.

In this connection, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that when statements have been made by the U.S. side about their readiness to eliminate nuclear weapons and when the Soviet Union has proposed as a first step the corresponding measures to start that process -- for example, to freeze nuclear weapons, to end nuclear weapons tests, and the non-first use of nuclear weapons -- all these practical steps by the Soviet Union have in fact been rejected by the present U.S. Administration for one reason or another. This is already a fine art, so to speak, for those people who have tried to reject these proposals to make it sound to the public as if the reasons for the U.S. rejections were

natural. So you can't solve the question of liquidating nuclear weapons by just making fine wishes. Concrete action needs to embarked on right now so as to completely liquidate nuclear weapons within the next 15 years. That is what is now being proposed by the Soviet Union; to sow all sorts of doubts about this and evade putting things into concrete terms or discussing these problems is to give succour to those forces and those circles who want to continue the nuclear arms race, including the United States. And there are a great deal of them, including in the upper echelons of U.S. power.

Now, a question from IZVESTIYA correspondent Sturua. It is for Comrade Korniyenko. How does the new Soviet proposal for complete liquidation of nuclear weapons harmonize with the Soviet side's position at the Geneva talks, in particular with the proposal on the 50-percent reduction of Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons?

[Korniyenko] The program we have proposed for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons on condition of a similar complete ban on space strike armaments have been formulated in such a way that all we proposed at the Geneva talks is organically combined in it. This also applies to the 50-percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. nuclear armaments which can reach each other's territory. Such a reduction would take place during the first and partly, during the second stage of the implementation of the program, as you can see on the chart.

So, no contradictions or difficulties arise between our new program and the continuation of the talks which are currently taking place in Geneva.

[Zamyatin] A question from an AKAHATA correspondent. Has the time not come to put the question signing an international agreement on the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons as soon as possible directly on the agenda of the international disarmament talks, including the Geneva talks? Would not the raising of this question also promote the solution of the question of preventing the militarization of space? Comrade Akhromeyev, please.

[Akhromeyev] The whole of our program that has been put forward and which we are examining here today in fact provides for that very thing. The question always arises of monitoring in that sphere, too. Extremely reliable facilities now exist in the world to verify whether a country is carrying out nuclear tests or not. It is now impossible, with today's level of development in science and technology, to deceive one another, to get around one another. A U.S. public organization, the Council for the Conservation of Natural Resources, has published a report it prepared on the underground nuclear weapons tests that are not announced by the United States -- the ones that are not announced. This organization states the United States has carried out 18 nuclear explosions it has not announced. But, at the same time it states that almost all of them have been recorded by the Hagfors observatory which operates under the Swedish institute of research in the field of national defense. As you can see, even unofficial organizations can detect the explosions that are carried out in the United States and are not announced. So, probably, developed states are able to monitor each other to find out whether the commitment is being carried out or not. The whole point is that the United States does not wish to accept an agreement banning nuclear tests and all sorts of means are used to explain to the world public its unwillingness.

[Zamyatin] A question from Mnatsakanov, Central Television: Does the Soviet Union consider it necessary for all the nuclear powers to support the proposed program right now or could some of them express their attitude toward it at a later stage?

I should like to answer that question. Although the Soviet Union's proposals are addressed first and foremost, to the United States -- at least in the first stage of implementation of the program -- the fundamental political support for it by all the other nuclear powers would be desirable from the very start. It is, in our view, an important prerequisite for putting it into practice, particularly as the Soviet proposals could also become the subject of talks or an exchange of opinions between all the nuclear powers, who would thus be able to express their ideas and get involved in the process of searching for mutually-acceptable solutions.

There is a group of questions from THE NEW YORK TIMES; from (Werner Ademann), correspondent of the FRANKFUERTER ALGEMEINE; and from (Engelbrecht) of the KOELNER STADTANZEIGER in the FRG. The gist of the questions is as follows: Mr. Gorbachev's proposal talks of eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe in the first stage of universal nuclear disarmament, while British and French missiles will remain in place until the second stage. Is this not a change in the previous stance of the Soviet Union and a movement of this stance closer to President Reagan's zero option proposal? I am not going to read out the other questions, they are similar. The one I read out was THE NEW YORK TIMES question.

[Korniyenko] First, the Soviet proposal has nothing in common with Reagan's zero option, the proposal on medium-range missiles, I mean. On the one hand, the "zero" according to Reagan envisaged that the Soviet Union had to destroy its medium-range missiles both in the European zone and in the east of the country. On the other hand, it did not exclude either the fact that the United States could give its own medium-range missiles to its NATO allies, or that Britain and France could themselves continue to build up their own corresponding nuclear arms. As you know from the statement by the general secretary and as is clear from the chart, this is not at all what we are proposing, so there is no suggestion of any comparison with Reagan's zero option.

Second, the new Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles is of course, a big and, I would say, a bold step on the path to freeing the European Continent of nuclear arms altogether. I would add that now, when the Soviet Union has expressed a willingness to eliminate all of its medium-range missiles here -- that is, in the European zone -- it would appear that even the Europeans who were intimidated by the Soviet SS-20 missiles -- they were intimidated without foundation, but nevertheless some people were intimidated -- that these Europeans will now be able to have their own weighty say as to whether or not they want to have U.S. missiles in their home, under conditions where there will be no Soviet missiles at all in the Soviet part.

[Correspondent in English] My name is (Rogers). I am with ABC.

[Announcer superimposes Russian translation] The ABC television company: Reagan said he considers Gorbachev's new proposal to be a constructive one and that is the general reaction in the world to the Soviet proposal. Why then are you appraising the U.S. standpoint overall in such a negative way?

[Zamyatin] We are not appraising the U.S. position in a completely negative way. We are saying that, along with positive elements, they are now also putting forward problems in their statements that to all intents and purposes act as a brake on these favorable relations. Yesterday, for instance, Weinberger said that there will be no changes in the U.S. position or shifts on issues regarding "star wars" or the SDI program, which we have mentioned.

Second [as heard], I would remind you that none other than Caspar Weinberger said yesterday that the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on nuclear explosions is unacceptable to the United States because at this stage the Soviet Union has allegedly carried out more explosions than the United States. But this is incorrect.

Finally, the same Weinberger says it is not acceptable for the United States to reduce its Pershing missiles now. And why? Because the Soviet Union can transfer its SS-20 missiles to the Asiatic part, then move them back into European country. So it is dangerous to move the Pershings, Weinberger warns. What the Soviet Union is talking about, however, is the liquidation of missiles, including the SS-20's in the European part. So our optimism -- and we would like to be very optimistic in assessing the U.S. position -- is coming up against statements by a number of persons from the upper echelon of the White House, bluntly saying that the most important elements in the Soviet plan are not acceptable to the certain circles which determine U.S. military policy. That is my reply to your question.

There is a long question from a correspondent of the Kuwaiti weekly AL-KHALIJ. It is about an atmosphere of trust. The time scale specified for implementing the new Soviet disarmament plan covers the terms of office of at least three U.S. presidents. Who can guarantee that the implementation of the accord defined in the plan will not be revised or interpreted in a new way, considering the lack of continuity in U.S. policy? All accords presuppose the existence of an atmosphere of trust. Can one also expect a detente in the area of freedom of information, meaning a mutual end to the propaganda campaigns and blame laying?

[Korniyenko] Unfortunately, it is true that the question -- I mean the first question about the lack of continuity in U.S. policy -- always has to be borne in mind, particularly in recent years since the new administration came to power in 1980. We know that a number of documents signed by the previous president have not been put into effect to this day. A number of treaties are being violated by the United States. I would not, however, take the pessimistic attitude that in that case it is completely impossible to try to reach agreement about anything because of what might happen in 2 years' time, or 4 years' time. The history of the United States, the history of Soviet- U.S. relations, and international life on the whole in the postwar period provides examples, good examples, where treaties signed with the United States have been implemented and are continuing to be implemented. Take for example, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the treaty banning nuclear weapons in the three mediums, and a number of others. So, I say again, our approach is not so pessimistic that the lack of continuity in U.S. policy creates an absolute barrier to achieving any accords. That would be a completely hopeless situation. So, of course, we are in favor of the treaties achieved being implemented regardless of a change in presidents. A treaty is reached and concluded with a state and let us hope for the best.

As far as ending the propaganda and exchanging information are concerned. Then naturally as material measures, as I would call them, are taken -- measures to end the arms race, to bring about disarmament, and in particular, to liquidate nuclear weapons -- the atmosphere will improve. On the other hand, in parallel with this, what we must do -- and we are doing this for our part -- is ensure that the atmosphere is not an obstacle to progress right now on the material side, so to speak. Here we will not be found wanting. We have never been the initiators of psychological warfare, the cold war, and so forth.

[Zamyatin] We have a final question from Kornilov, a TASS correspondent. The question if this: It is known that all previous arms limitation talks have been prolonged. What are the tasks that face the states and the peoples now so that the proposals set out in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev might be implemented?

The Soviet leadership fully appreciates that the task that has been set is a difficult one and that the search for specific solutions is also a difficult one. In order to completely free the world of nuclear weapons, they require great efforts. But the Soviet leadership realizes equally well that the situation taking shape in the world, or -- if you will -- history, grants us all an extremely short time in which to find such solutions. It has already been stressed several times -- and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has spoken of this more than once, including during his conversations in Geneva with the President of the United States -- that the present world situation is too complex, too dangerous for any delay in resolving problems upon which mankind's survival depends to be permitted; tomorrow the situation may become still more complex and dangerous. The answer to the question asked by the TASS observer I would give as this: Yes, we believe that the world can be rid of the threat of nuclear disaster; the world can be rid of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. What is needed for this? For this, it is necessary that all, upon whom the resolution of the problems indicated depends, demonstrate an understanding of the responsibility they bear and show the political will and readiness to embark without delay upon the quest for practical solutions to questions of nuclear, space, and other armaments. We are convinced of this and we are convinced that the enormous plan, the state-by-stage plan, which the Soviet Union has put forward for state examination, is realizable.

I would like to thank all of you for your attention and bid farewell on behalf of those taking part in the press conference.

Diagram at Press Conference

LD201900 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1525 GMT on 18 January broadcasts a 30-minute report with quoted passages on the press conference held in Moscow by Zamyatin, Akhromeyev, and Korniyenko about Gorbachev's 15 January arms proposal. The video recording reveals a diagram on the rostrum behind the sneakers. The diagram, which is headed "USSR Proposal on a Program for the Complete Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in the Entire World by the Year 2000." is in the form of a time-line chart divided into three columns that are labeled "1st Stage," "2d Stage," and "3d Stage," Although the extreme left of the diagram cannot be seen clearly to indicate a date, the dividing line between the "1st stage" column and the "2d stage" column is labeled "1990," and the one between the "2d stage" and "3d stage" columns is labeled "1995," while the extreme right edge of the chart is labeled "2000."

The following appears in the "1st stage" column below the subhead "USSR and USA:" "terminate all nuclear explosions; over 5-8 years reduce nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory by 50 percent, and renounce manufacture, testing, and deployment of space strike weapons; retain no more than 6,000 warheads per side for the delivery vehicles remaining after the reduction; totally eliminate medium-range missiles (ballistic and cruise) in the European zone; and do not supply strategic missiles, medium-range missiles, or warheads for them to other countries." In the lower portion of the column is the subhead "Britain and France: but the details below the subhead cannot be seen.

The second column contains a "USSR and USA" subhead and the following: "Freeze their tactical nuclear weapons." The column also contains "Other Nuclear Powers" and "All Nuclear Powers" subheads, but the details are not seen.

Centered on the "1995" line and thereby, under both the second and third stage columns is the following: "USSR and USA implement further measures for the elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons."

In the "3d stage" column under a "USSR and USA" subhead appears the following: "complete the elimination of all their remaining nuclear weapons." The column also contains the subhead "Other Nuclear Powers," but the details under it are indistinct.

/6091
CSO: 1236

GORBACHEV'S PROPOSAL DISCUSSED DURING SHEVARDNADZE'S JAPAN TRIP

Meets With Abe

LD161755 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Excerpts] Tokyo, January 16 TASS -- Talks were continued here today between Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Shintaro Abe, minister of foreign affairs of Japan.

In the course of the talks Eduard Shevardnadze drew the attention of the Japanese side to the latest major foreign policy proposals, formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement on January 15 on arms control and disarmament problems. It was pointed out that the concrete program presented in that statement really paved the way to the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 if agreement was reached on the prohibition of the development, testing and deployment of space strike weapons. These and other new Soviet proposals are addressed to all the countries and peoples. And the sooner they are translated into practical deeds, the safer life in our world will become.

The sides had an extensive exchange of opinion on a broad range of international issues. Both were unanimous that it was necessary to take effective measures to lessen world tension and to strengthen security, inter alia, in Asia and the Pacific.

On the same day Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe gave a reception in honour of Eduard Shevardnadze. Addressing the audience, Shintaro Abe said that Japan was attaching special importance to the development of relations with her neighbour, the Soviet Union, and believed that those relations should be stable and rest on true mutual understanding. He gave a positive appraisal of the new Soviet initiative, presented in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, for the removal of nuclear weapons, and called for concrete results at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Mikhail Gorbachev's statement which was released in Moscow today presents a bold and realistic alternative to the nuclear threat and to the development of space weapons, chemical agents and conventional weapons based on new physical principles and comparable in their deadly effects to nuclear weapons, an alternative which is basically new in conception and radical in measures it proposes.

The statement sets the truly great goal of reaching the third millennium without weapons of mass destruction. That goal is not only proclaimed: the programme suggested by us points to a clear and concrete way of accomplishing it. The Soviet Union stands for ridding the world of all weapons of mass destruction in three stages over the 15 years till the end of the 20th century.

At the first stage the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the USA capable of reaching each other's territories are to be reduced by half. That formula was accepted as the basis at the meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan in Geneva for drafting an accord at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. The other nuclear powers are to join in this process at the second stage.

Nuclear weapons are to be eliminated universally and completely by the end of 1999. Herein lies the great historical importance of our initiative and its unique practical purpose.

A radical solution on medium-range systems is also envisioned. There must remain neither Soviet nor American medium-range missiles in Europe. Agreement to this effect could be reached in principle already now.

Discussing the Soviet Union's position on its missiles in the eastern part of the country, Eduard Shevardnadze noted that their level, as everyone knows, is being frozen and is made directly dependent on the military-strategic situation in that region. If the number of nuclear systems offset by our missiles is lessened, fewer Soviet missiles will remain in the East. In this way, he stressed, the very essence of our proposal indicates that there will be no nuclear weapons here as well.

Eduard Shevardnadze further pointed out that the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions had been in effect since August 6, 1985. It expired on December 31 but, guiding itself by the desire to create favourable conditions for the fulfilment of the program of nuclear disarmament, our country decided to extend it to March 31. A new chance is being given to the United States in this way. We hope that it follows our example.

Mikhail Gorbachev stressed in his statement the importance of dependable verification of a mutual moratorium if it is achieved. Proposals on verification to the point of mutual on-site inspection deny the last arguments to those who would like to avoid such a moratorium.

Verification -- and dependable verification -- is viewed by us as the most important and essential element of measures to eliminate nuclear and other weapons. When verification with national technical facilities does not provide sufficient certainty, on-site inspection and forms of international control can be used comprehensively.

This initiative is another concrete manifestation of the humanism of the foreign policy of the Soviet state and confirmation of the fact that our country, advancing towards the 27th congress of its party, expresses the aspirations of the peoples and stands for peace.

The Soviet Union is motivated not only by its worry for the future. Memory of the past, and not only of our past, always has an effect on its actions. The Soviet people's aspirations for peace are not limited to their homeland. Our people paid too dear a price for their life of peace but the bells of Hiroshima are also tolling in their memory.

We hope, Eduard Shevardnadze said, that the Government of Japan will closely and without bias study the proposals put forward by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and make its contribution to the noble cause of removing nuclear and chemical weapons and of preventing the reemgence of space weapons. This position will meet the interests of primarily the Japanese people themselves and of their security.

We would like the place of your country in the struggle against the nuclear threat to be in accord with Japan's role and weight in the present-day world. Our talks have shown that the USSR and Japan, even despite their differences, could do a great deal for peace and for stronger international security by working together.

The reception passed in a friendly atmosphere.

Press Conference, Departure Reported

PM191748 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Visit Concluded"]

[Excerpts] Tokyo, 19 Jan -- E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, has received at the USSR Embassy in Japan T. Araki, mayor of the city of Hiroshima, and H. Motoshima, mayor of the city of Nagasaki.

The mayors of the Japanese cities stated that the people of Japan, who are the only people in the world to have experienced the horrors of atomic bombing, fully desire to prevent any repetition of the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On behalf of their cities' inhabitants they gave a high assessment of the Soviet government's decision to extend the moratorium on all nuclear explosions and called on other states possessing nuclear weapons, above all the United States, to join in the moratorium as soon as possible.

E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that the Soviet program of eliminating nuclear weapons by the end of this century put forward by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev was in accord with the mood of all the peoples, including the peoples of the Asian continent. Its implementation would also rid the peoples of that part of the globe of the fear of nuclear threat and would raise security in Asia to a qualitatively new level.

E.A. Shevardnadze held a press conference for journalists.

A central place in the talks, E.A. Shevardnadze observed, was occupied by discussion of the major new foreign policy initiatives put forward in CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's Statement, which open up a real path to eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by the end of the present century.

The comprehensive, all-embracing program proposed by the Soviet Union has evoked great interest in the world and received extensive support both from governments and the public. One, however, cannot fail to notice that attempts are already being made to erode the substance of our proposals and instill in people's minds skepticism and lack of faith in the attainability of the goals set.

Once more we hear references to the fact that the Soviet Union is allegedly putting prior conditions forward again. It, you see, insists on the United States' renouncing the "star wars" program. For those people who are intent in starting an arms race in a specially dangerous area -- in outer space -- this stance of ours is indeed an obstacle. But it is absurd to talk about eliminating nuclear weapons in combination with the creation [sozdaniye] of new space strike arms which are in no way inferior to nuclear

arms and are also conceived as a supplement to the already existing potential of weapons of mass destruction. If we have decided to disarm, arms must be eliminated rather than shifting weapons from the earth into the heavens.

The proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, E.A. Shevardnadze observed, provide a real alternative to the increasingly dangerous arms race, against which a barrier must be erected. To achieve that goal the Soviet Union is ready for broad collaboration with all those who act from a position of reason, good will, and awareness of responsibility for securing for mankind a future without wars or weapons.

E.A. Shevardnadze then answered journalists' questions.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1236

SUPREME SOVIET SENDS MESSAGE TO U.S. CONGRESS

PM191826 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jan 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "Address by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the U.S. Congress"]

[Text] Follows the full text of the address of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the U.S. Congress:

Esteemed members of the Congress of the United States of America,

Guided by the aims of reducing international tension, which has reached dangerous proportions, striving to ward off the threat of mankind's nuclear destruction, and, on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its Presidium addresses you on the question, whose solution brooks no delay.

The nuclear arms race, which devours tremendous material resources and which leads to the unproductive squandering of our countries' scientific and technological potential, is continuing. The rivalry in the military sphere is the main source of instability, a growing threat to peace.

One cannot put up with such a state of affairs any longer, when the danger of a nuclear catastrophe hands over the heads of the people like the sword of Damocles. It is the conscience of mankind, the natural instinct of self-preservation that calls for doing away with it.

This is precisely why the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet States' supreme organ of legislative power, resolutely speaks out in support of the attainment of weighty and efficient decisions at the current negotiations, that would firmly put an end to the arms race both in outer space and on earth and would enable the release of huge sums of money for creative purposes, for assistance to the peoples striving to liquidate their economic backwardness. Of great significance in that matter could be actions on the basis of mutual example, parallel steps that could prevent the situation from deteriorating, could be a spur to moving away from decades of nuclear armaments stockpiling to joint, consistent efforts to eliminate them.

The USSR Supreme Soviet welcomed the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, qualifying the negotiations between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan as creating possibilities for changing to the constructive quest for ways of normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations, ways of improving the international situation as a whole.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States share the goal of liquidating nuclear weapons fully and everywhere. In our view, it is now necessary to start advancing jointly toward this goal. The question arises which path is to be taken?

We know of the concept which says it is allegedly possible to come to liquidation of nuclear weapons by creating qualitatively new armaments and their placement in outer space. We are convinced, however, that to shape policy on such a calculation means to commit an irreparable error. The history of the arms race has convincingly proved that no new weapons lessen the danger to mankind, but on the contrary, heighten it. In the event of the appearance of weapons in outer space, the nuclear arms race would be escalated with unprecedented force and follow the most dangerous directions rather than be stopped.

For the first time in the history of the nuclear age, the Soviet Union has put forward a wide-scale, concrete and accurately timed program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. We propose to implement and complete within the next 15 years -- that is as early as the year 2000 -- the process of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons given the ban on space strike arms. Mankind should enter the third millenium free from the burden of the most destructive weapons which have placed the lives of all people in jeopardy.

Concrete proposals on that score are contained in the statement made by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on 15 January 1986.

Within the framework of that program, 50-percent reductions of the relevant Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms would constitute only the first stage, to be followed both by further reductions in the Soviet and U.S. arsenals and the joining of the other nuclear powers in that process. Reliable verification, including on-site inspections, would be established.

As is known, the Soviet Union has long proposed to free Europe from nuclear weapons, both intermediate-range and tactical ones. Without the framework of the first stage of the program we consider it possible to agree on the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range missiles in the European zone, both ballistic and cruise missiles. The realization of such an agreement would serve as a first step along the road to ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons.

In so doing the United States should, naturally, pledge not to supply its strategic and intermediate-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France should pledge not to build up their respective nuclear arms.

The U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear arms would be eliminated completely in the course of further implementing the program.

The USSR Supreme Soviet urges the U.S. Congress to choose exactly the alternative formulated in our program -- this only reasonable and feasible alternative to nuclear weapons. It is our conviction that at the present time there exist all the necessary prerequisites for this.

The USSR proposes to solve the question of chemical weapons as radically -- to completely eliminate these weapons together with their industrial base under strict verification, including international on-site inspections.

To take a practical step toward curbing the arms race in its most dangerous direction -- the nuclear direction -- further staging of any nuclear tests should be stopped, first and foremost. For it is clear, that if there are no nuclear explosions, there will be no basis for improving nuclear arms and developing [sozdaniye] their new, even more destructive, types. For in the absence of the tests an objective process of obsolescence of the nuclear arsenals and, in the last analysis, their complete withering away would begin.

Striving to set a good example, the Soviet Union stopped holding any nuclear explosions on its territory as of 6 August 1985 and strictly abides by that unilateral obligation. At the same time, the USSR urged the U.S. Government to show restraint as well and for its part, give up the holding of nuclear explosions.

Unfortunately, it has to be stated that to date the U.S. side has not responded in kind to that peaceable action of the Soviet Union. And new nuclear weapon explosions are conducted in the United States.

The movement for an end to nuclear tests is mounting in the world. We know that the demands to put an end to these dangerous experiments are also broadening in your country. Responding to the calls of the public, prominent statesmen, and public figures of all continents and guided by the striving to ensure solution of the question on a mutual basis, the Soviet Union has declared the extension of our unilateral moratorium for three more months.

The Soviet Union thereby demonstrates in deed restraint in the military sphere, on the need to display which our countries agreed upon in Geneva. The USSR undertook the step with the thought in mind to give the U.S. side extra time to make the decision that the peoples of the whole world are expecting from Washington. We call upon the United States to follow the Soviet Union's example, not to block the realisation of this very important task which is of great significance for the whole of mankind any longer.

The arguments of those who advocate continuation of nuclear tests are totally at odds with the interests of consolidating strategic stability and preventing the threat of war. The arms race -- and the continuing nuclear experiments are aimed precisely at whipping it up -- cannot be the mainstay of durable peace. On the contrary, the testing of ever new types of nuclear weapons and putting them into service heightens tension, breeds mistrust and mutual suspicion, and brings the threat of a fatal conflict, which should be avoided nearer rather than wards it off.

Should the moratorium on nuclear explosions become mutual, this would undoubtedly give a powerful impetus to attaining agreements on limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, consolidating and broadening mutual confidence. The moratorium is an indispensable and important element in the general context of efforts aimed at ending the arms race, at implementing the fundamental accords that were reached in Geneva.

At the same time, questions of verificationare by no means an obstacle to the introduction of the moratorium. The Soviet side is prepared to go far -- right to mutual on-site inspections to verify the non-conduct of explosions. The road to a mutually acceptable accord has been opened here. What is needed to cover that road is political will alone. The Soviet side has such a will. Making this address on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, its presidium expresses the hope that the U.S. Congress and its members will raise their voices in support of the complete and general elimination of nuclear weapons and in favor of the introduction of a bilateral Soviet-U.S.

moratorium on any nuclear explosions as a first step toward this goal. There can be no doubt that such a position by the U.S. Congress would be assessed everywhere as a manifestation of high responsibility for enhancing the security of nations, for the destinies of universal peace.

The time has come to put an end to the nuclear arms race madness. Nuclear blasts must be stopped from disfiguring the beautiful face of our common home, the planet earth. The nuclear threat should be eliminated for good.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet

/6091
CSO: 5200/1236

SOVIET CORRESPONDENTS EXAMINE CHANCES FOR PROGRESS AT TALKS

'Moments That Give Rise to Concern'

LD161853 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 16 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev

The latest statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, which contains a comprehensive programme of eliminating nuclear weapons, stresses the prime importance of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments that were resumed in Geneva today.

Can one expect from them any shifts, practical results? This question is being asked now not only by political observers, but also the world public at large.

Hopes that constructive solutions can be found to problems of international security re-emerged following the recent meeting in Geneva between Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The principled provision of their joint declaration to the effect that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, that there can be no winners in it, and that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States will seek to achieve military superiority evoked universal approval.

It is also noteworthy that the top leaders of both nations agreed to accelerate the work at the Geneva negotiations with a view to accomplishing the tasks set down earlier of preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth.

The programme for a total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, set forth by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, creates an opportunity for making a genuine turn for the better in international relations and ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear annihilation.

The Soviet delegation to the talks confirmed on arrival in Geneva that it is prepared for a constructive dialogue. The dialogue itself, however, as well as the elaboration of mutually acceptable accords demand efforts from both sides. Regrettably, the American position reveals a number of moments that give rise to concern. This applies primarily to the persistent attempts by U.S. reactionary circles to reject the positive results of the Geneva meeting, to preserve and expand new programmes of armaments, above all, the notorious "star wars" project.

Equally worrying is the statement by the U.S. delegation that it intends to stick to the early proposals despite the fact that they not only totally ignore the key issue

of banning the development of strike space armaments but, once realized, would also bring about an actual increase in the number of nuclear warheads and enable the United States to achieve unilateral military advantages.

According to Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, reaching tangible results at the Geneva talks would mean filling with considerable material content the Soviet side's programme for a total eradication of nuclear armaments by the year 2000. This is what peoples all over the world expect, this is what they demand.

'Responsible Approach' Essential

LD161853 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Report by commentator Sergey Pravdin with comments by correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev from Geneva]

[Text] [Pravdin] The USSR-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons resume in Geneva today. As noted in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during the Soviet-U.S. summit last November it was decided to speed up the talks; this accord cannot remain just a declaration. The Soviet delegation in Geneva will have instructions to act in strict accordance with this accord. We, the statement says, expect the same constructive approach from the U.S. side. above all on the questions of space. Our correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev reports from Geneva:

[Dmitriyev] The new round is beginning in conditions which are more favorable for achieving progress than the preceding round because as you know, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting took place here in Geneva 2 months ago and during it the decision was made to speed up the talks. As far as the Soviet side is concerned, it has been and still is devoted to the cause of very speedily reaching concrete accords on all directions of the talks. It is essential that Washington also displays a responsible approach.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1236

PRAVDA: REAGAN 'RESORTS TO SELECTIVE INTERPRETATION'

PM181340 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

["Statement by the U.S. President"--PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The White House has released a statement by the U.S. President for journalists in connection with the fourth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms which have opened in Geneva. The statement says the upcoming session represents an opportunity to give new momentum to arms limitation negotiations, building upon the fresh start in Soviet-U.S. relations that the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the U.S. President made at their meeting in Geneva. The statement expresses the wish that the new round of talks provide the opportunity to "translate the agreement on general principles that we reached in Geneva into real progress at the negotiations."

Noteworthy at the same time is the fact that at the very beginning of this statement the subject agreed on for the Geneva talks is presented in a truncated form. The space component was arbitrarily omitted from it. The U.S. President, as seen from his statement, resorts to selective interpretation of the documents on which agreement was reached in Geneva, trying to portray the matter as if the talks in Geneva should focus only on those areas in which "there are points of contact" between the sides. Such issues as preventing the arms race in outer space are left out.

Several observers point out in this connection that to resist the solution of the problems of space means not wishing to end the arms race on earth.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1236

SOVIET GENERAL SEES U.S. 'UNDERMINING' GENEVA RESULTS

LD142136 Moscow International Service in Polish 1400 GMT 14 Jan 86

[Interview with Major General Mikhail Yasyukov, head of department of the General Staff Academy of the Soviet Armed Forces, by unidentified correspondent; date and place not given--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Yasyukov] The preparations made by the Soviet Union for the meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, and the Geneva meeting itself, initiated a new stage in the struggle for maintaining and consolidating peace.

[Question] Have some changes appeared, then, in the stance of the United States and the other NATO countries?

[Yasyukov] Indeed, certain noticed. The circles ruling those countries are no longer in a position to ignore the force of public opinion; the force of the antimilitaristic protest which has considerably increased recently. The threat of war is so great that the scale of the antiwar movement has increased as never before. In these conditions, the United States was forced to enter into top-level negotiations with the Soviet Union.

[Question] But the most reactionary circles of imperialism have not given up their attempts to achieve military supremacy over socialism. This is proved by undeniable facts, after all.

[Yasyukov] Yes, this is indeed so. Can one deny it, if at present, within the implementation of the "star wars" program, contracts have been concluded with 800 firms for the construction of space weapons? There are a great many other facts. For instance, it emerges from official data alone that between 6 August 1985 and 1 January 1986, the United States carried out six nuclear test explosions. In that period, the Soviet Union, in accordance with its moratorium, did not carry out any explosions.

[Question] Is one to think, then, that some actions by the U.S. Administration are capable of undermining the results achieved in Geneva?

[Yasyukov] The conclusions suggest themselves. At present, a campaign against the building of mutual trust between the Soviet Union and the United States, against normalization of relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, is

being initiated. The hired troops who are carrying on armed activity against Nicaragua and Angola, against Afghanistan and Cambodia, are getting increasing supplies of arms. The United States has imposed sanctions on Libya. Basically, these facts prove the intensification of the aggressive machinations of U.S. imperialism regarding these countries. International Peace Year will not be peaceful. This can be said with all certainty. For the hope which shone in Geneva to become a lasting trend, peace-loving forces should step up their efforts.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1236

IZVESTIYA: KENNAN EXEMPLIFIES CHANGING U.S. ATTITUDES

PM161633 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Changing Thinking"]

[Text] The reference point calling for action on the part of all governments and all people of goodwill -- the destruction of weapons of mass annihilation -- is acquiring specific contours and is being placed on a practical footing. That is the historical purport and significance of what is said in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The unceasing, hard worldwide struggle for a guaranteed future for our planet is scaling new heights. For over 4 decades now nuclear weapons have been stockpiled. This causes alarm and concern among an increasing number of people, including the big bourgeoisie camp in the West. The 1 and 1/2 decades remaining to the year 2000 can, MUST [uppercase word published in capitals] become a breakthrough, a turning point toward man's liberation from the arsenals of mass death and total destruction.

This accords with the thoughts and aspirations of the world community in the fullest, most exhaustive sense of the word. Every day new voices are added to the voices of alarm and reason. A few days ago George Kennan, the patriarch of Washington's postwar diplomacy, issued one more call for reason on the pages of an influential U.S. newspaper. The change in his views is characteristic of the shaping of a new way of thinking among those people in the West who used to take the hardest, even a bellicose, stance, but who now -- fully aware of what exactly has been staked on the card of war and peace -- are expressing themselves from positions of personal and general human responsibility for the present and future.

Kennan's voice is in many ways notable and characteristic of the underlying processes of rethinking several formerly standard, ossified concepts and views among the top stratum of society in the United States and other Western countries.

George Kennan's name is well known not only in his own country, in the United States. His books are in the libraries of other countries and his articles are read and published in various languages. It would perhaps be difficult to find a scholar, former diplomat and journalist in the United States right now with such extensive, broad experience in these spheres. He was the first U.S. diplomat to visit our country in an official capacity: In 1933 in connection with the U.S. -- very much delayed -- establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

He served his class loyally and became U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union just after the war. In this capacity, he contributed to stoking the "cold war," which he later regretted -- in his memoirs. The turning point which caused him to revise his views was 1949, when our country, coming up against the frenzied nuclear arms race in the United States, assimilated the production of its own nuclear weapons for exclusively defensive purposes.

This news had a sobering effect on Kennan, who was a member of Washington's "brain trust." He began to express himself in favor of a political, peaceful solution of vexing problems with our country. He immediately found himself "persona non grata." He was immediately moved from the political arena, but the further he was moved the more his conviction strengthened that the normal development of Soviet-U.S. relations is vitally necessary for the sake of the national interests of the United States itself. Under President Kennedy, G. Kennan served as ambassador to Yugoslavia and then engaged in scholarly activity and journalism. He continues to work in this field to this day.

Among the influential figures whose statements are heeded by the public in the United States and other Western countries, Kennan is not the only one to have looked back on the steps he has taken and their results and to have belatedly grieved over the blunders he has made and the errors he has committed. We can point to Henry Kissinger, for instance. Finding himself unemployed after leaving his post as U.S. secretary of state, in a retrospective analysis of the actions of the administration in which he had served, he regretted being among those who in the early seventies "okayed" the creation of missiles with multiple warheads. "I regret," Kissinger said, "that I did not think through at the time what a world armed with these warheads would become."

But in contrast to the former State Department chief, Kennan acts far more consistently and explicitly in opposing the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. He is old. That does not hinder, but, on the contrary, lends more weight to his statements on a key theme which, it may be said without exaggeration, perturbs the broadest strata of people throughout the world.

Early this year another compatriot of Kennan -- and a considerably younger one -- Senator G. Hart, quoted the following words of General Omar Bradley, spoken in 1957, when, as is well known, weapons arsenals were considerably below present-day levels: "We (that is the Americans) have corrupted our intellect by creating scientific means of destruction such that we are threatened with the desperate danger of destroying ourselves... The time will come when we will be able to do little except live in alarm, suppressing our fear beneath the thickening shadow of death."

On the basis of the lessons of history, looking ahead many thinking Americans in our day are demonstrating not futility or fatalism in their approach to the key problems of the present day and primarily, the problem of war and peace, but vigor and the resolve to seek a fundamental normalization of the international atmosphere.

From this viewpoint it is meaningful to dwell on George Kennan's article just published in the U.S. newspaper NEWSDAY. It contains a look at the past and the future. Recalling the years he spent in our country as a diplomat at the end of World War II, the author writes that "the destruction over a substantial part of Russia's territory had to be seen to be believed." The victory opened up the prospect which had long been awaited, for which people had fought. "The entire Russian people felt the need for peace and were gripped with the desire for peace."

What does Kennan write about the present day? The arms race is what poses the most terrible danger in the contemporary world. "We must recognize," the author concludes, "that the sources of our troubles and of the dangers threatening us are to a considerable degree" unconnected with the Soviet Union. "And some of them even lie within ourselves," that is within U.S. policy. "Above all, the Americans must learn in which aspects to restrain themselves: This includes the damage we are causing to the environment, our tendency not to live according to our means and to run up catastrophic debts, our obvious inability to reduce the colossal budget deficit..."

As for Soviet-U.S. relations, this is Kennan's firm conviction: "Although there are serious political differences between the two countries, there is no unresolved political issue between them which might prompt them to start a Soviet-U.S. war or which could be resolved with the aid of any major military conflict of this nature."

And last, but not least. "It is perfectly clear to me," the author notes, "that the Soviet leaders do not want war with us and are not planning to start a war. In particular, I have never believed that their interests require the military seizure of Western Europe or that they might attack that region in the postwar decades, even if the so-called concept of 'nuclear deterrence' did not exist."

An increasing number of people in the world, including prominent politicians and public figures in the West, refuse to tolerate the idea of the "inevitability" of the endless buildup of the most devastating and destructive weapons. One U.S. wit observed that if the cost of military supplies in the United States continue to grow at the present rate, by the year 2000 the country's entire military budget will be used to purchase a single super bomber!

Another fact which AP reported in August last year from Rarotonga in the Cook Islands: A poster pinned to a coconut palm near an office in the settlement voices the attitude of the Pacific Ocean countries to nuclear weapons: "If they are safe, station them in Washington, store their waste in Tokyo, and test them in Paris"...

Thus, even the smallest countries are categorically against "experimental" bombs being exploded underwater, underground, or in the air.

The waves of the antiwar, antinuclear movement spread from the banks of the Potomac to the atolls of the Pacific Ocean. They break with ever increasing force against the Pentagon walls. It is impossible to fail to notice this. "Is there still room in our world for heroic feats?" a Belgian magazine asked. Indeed there is. The curbing of the arms race would be the greatest feat of mankind.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1236

LE MONDE VIEWS GORBACHEV'S NUCLEAR WEAPONS PLAN

PM171124 Paris LE MONDE in French 17 Jan 86 p 1

[Editorial: "Mr Gorbachev's Wonderful Plan"]

[Text] Who could oppose the disappearance of nuclear weapons from the planet? No sensible person, of course. And it is probably because he knew the answer to this question that Mr Gorbachev has just caused a sensation once again by proposing, on the eve of the resumption of American-Soviet negotiations in Geneva, a program aimed quite simply at eliminating all nuclear weapons in the world before the end of the century.

It is rather a clever move even if it is easy to see right through it: For a long time -- at least since the Stockholm appeal -- the Soviet leadership has understood the one-way use it could make of the very legitimate aspirations of Western public opinion. The approach made by Mr Gorbachev on Wednesday obviously follows this tradition. But since this is no longer the fifties, there is reason to wonder whether it goes a little too far.

This is the question which is clearly being asked in Washington, where Mr Reagan very quickly issued a communique noting positive elements in the Soviet proposal. There are several reasons for the American reaction: first, the desire not to lose a point in the propaganda war which has been going on between the two superpowers for several months and in which Mr Gorbachev has proved to be much more imaginiative than his predecessors, and, in addition to this tactical explanation, the factor of Reagan's personality.

There is no doubt that the current president, who has all too often been caricatured as a trigger-happy cowboy, is moved by the prospect of a nuclear-free world as described by Mr Gorbachev. This dream is part of his puritan morality and he has mentioned it himself several times. Moreover, this is his justification for his Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] -- the space shield intended to render nuclear weapons obsolete, the feasibility of which, however, is still doubtful and which worries Mr Gorbachev so much.

Moreover, in the short term -- because we must stop dreaming -- the general secretary's peace plan is essentially aimed at thwarting SDI. The Soviet leader is telling us explicitly that the proposal is only valid if the United States promises not to manufacture and deploy its space defense system, although it seems to be understood that research on the SDI will be able to continue. In addition Moscow would be prepared to conclude an agreement between now and 1990 on dismantling all medium-range missiles,

as well as the cruise missiles deployed in Europe, and leaving the French and British deterrent forces as they are. At the same time the Americans and Soviets would negotiate a 50-percent reduction in their intercontinental arsenals. Mr Gorbachev's plan includes another two stages to reach the total destruction of nuclear weapons before the start of the third millenium.

These last two phases of the Gorbachev plan, which are the furthest off, are the most surrealistic. Indeed they presuppose that the nuclear powers will give up the advantage these weapons give them. They also presuppose means of technical monitoring which do not yet exist. Moreover, some of these problems are likely to arise well before 1990, since any American-Soviet agreement on the Euromissiles reached according to Mr Gorbachev's criteria would force London and Paris to abandon the current modernization of their deterrent forces...and would therefore cause divisions among allies.

/9738
CSO: 5200/2622

USSR'S ZAGLADIN ON INTERNATIONAL ISSUES IN HUNGARIAN PAPER

AU141341 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 11 Jan 86 p 5

[Interview with Vadim Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy head of the Central Committee's International Department, by special correspondent Peter Sereny and Moscow correspondent Istvan Zalai in Moscow: "Interview With Soviet Politician Vadim Zagladin--Where Is the World Heading After Geneva?"; date not given; first paragraph is paper's introduction]

[Excerpts] With the approach of the CPSU Congress, we asked Vadim Zagladin, CPSU Central Committee member and first deputy head of the Central Committee's International Department (of Central Committee secretary level), to comment on some international issues and current issues of Soviet peace policy. He received our special correspondent Peter Sereny and our Moscow correspondent Istvan Zalai at the Headquarters of the Central Committee in Moscow.

[Sereny, Zalai] In their foreign policy, the CPSU and the Soviet State start from the realities of the changing world. What is new nowadays in the activity of Soviet foreign policy?

[Zagladin] Last year's April CPSU Central Committee plenum spoke with emphasis about the importance of a multifaceted activization of Soviet foreign policy. You are right in saying that the CPSU and the Soviet State starts from the realities of our current world. The main characteristics of this reality are that the world has reached a very responsible and important crossroads. The dialectics of the arms race are such that, taking into consideration existing weapons and particularly those now appearing -- I mean the space war weapons -- war is in fact an impossibility. However, irresponsible forces might unleash one. In that event war would lead to global catastrophe. There would be no winners in this war.

Therefore, it was necessary to reevaluate certain truths considered to be absolute for centuries, such as, "if you want peace, prepare for war." Today it is obvious that further preparation for war does not at all guarantee the consolidation of peace. Neither can we strengthen the security of countries generally by accumulating increasingly destructive armaments of increasing power.

This fact dictated the Soviet leadership's serious and responsible steps to break the course of events and to make a turn from the arms race towards a reduction of arms and from confrontation towards detente. It was in the spirit of this fact that the Soviet Union took the unilateral steps that are well known also to Hungarian readers, like halting primarily the nuclear tests, placing a moratorium

on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles on the European part of the Soviet Union, and even reducing the number of missiles already deployed to the level of June 1984. We have also declared that we will not be the first to go into space with arms. Here we must also mention the wide-ranging proposals of the Soviet Union like the ones aimed at avoiding the militarization of space and radically reducing -- by 50 percent -- the number of U.S. and Soviet nulcear missiles capable of reaching each other's territory.

[Zalai, Sereny] What do you think about the possible Soviet-U.S. arms negotiation developments 1 and 1/2 months after Geneva?

[Zagladin] The Geneva conference between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan was a historic event. However, the results achieved there can only be evaluated on the basis of both parties' concrete acts. At the moment, a good many statements can be heard in the United States in support of peace, disarmament, and the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations. However, as far as deeds are concerned, they do not match up to the statements, or to be more precise: they oppose them. Indeed, arming is continuing in the United States. This applies to the "star wars" preparations, and what is more, the use of nuclear devices (this has been indicated by the recent nuclear explosion in Nevada, the aim of which was to test the nuclear generator system of space lasers).

Can the political line of "new globalism" that has been advocated by the United States and adopted in practice in fact be considered as being in accordance with the Geneva agreement? In fact, this is outright interference in other states' domestic affairs, and it threatens to create new hotbeds for military conflicts. Neither can we consider the intentions of the United States to cause the disintegration of the socialist community, which manifest themselves in attempts to pit certain countries or parties against others, as being in the spirit of Geneva. In other words, since Geneva, the atmosphere of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and the international atmosphere in general, has somewhat improved. But, in my opinion, it is dangerous to exaggerate the significance of this improvement. Considering the deeds of the United States in practice, the logical question emerges: What if they are trying to use this new atmosphere to disguise the old political line?

The world has remained complicated and complex, and for the time being, it has not been possible to stop the actual trends behind confrontations and the arms race. From this we draw the following conclusion: Efforts must continue to stabilize peace, activate joint peace offensives so that we arrive at a real turning point in world affairs. And it is natural that the internal success of the countries of socialism, the fulfillment of their programs for domestic affairs and the economy, continues to play a significant role, or if you like, fulfills the role of a foundation for peace. Our parties are all responsible before their peoples for the implementation of their political course, and this in turn is a great responsibility before the people of the world.

[Sereny, Zalai] To what extent is it possible for Soviet-U.S. relations to return to their normal channels? What reasons are there in favor of cooperation and what interests hinder it?

[Zagladin] It cannot be said that the relationship of the Soviet Union and the United States has been perfectly normal in the past, even if we think of the years of detente. The Soviet Union wishes to have good-neighborly relations with the United States, it

wants to have peaceful cooperation in those issues where it is possible. So far, this has not been possible. And this is not the fault of the Soviet party.

What is the obstacle? It is the mood, the plans, and actions of social and political groups in the United States (and in some other Western countries) which have not abandoned the idea of gaining power and continue to regard military superiority and dictates to other nations as being the main purpose and task of their activities.

The CPSU's political line, the political line of all the countries in the socialist community, and their efforts to stop the arms race and confrontation, on the other hand, do promote a return to normal terms between the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Sereny, Zalai] In what form is it possible to return to detente?

[Zagladin] Let us have no guesses. At the moment it is clear that the first step on the road to peace must be the end of the arms race. There would be a great leap forword on this road if the United States agreed to introduce the moratorium on nuclear tests. Namely, such a moratorium is the same as taking steps toward an appropriate agreement on the gradual and complete elimination of nuclear explosions, and thus, the elimination of nuclear weaposn. Of course, it would be very significant if success for the Geneva negotiations on arms limitation were assured. At the meeting of the two countries' leaders there was agreement to speed up these negotiations.

They will soon commence and we shall see what conduct the U.S. representatives demonstrate. I myself, am not as yet an optimist, because the above mentioned practical steps of the United States do not give any ground for us to hope for rapid progress.

It is possible that the development in East-West relations will promote a return to detente. These contacts, including economic relations, help to improve the atmosphere and to make a part of those groups that are as yet passive join the side of detente.

However, there is no ground yet for exaggerating the role of such contacts. It is progress in the main strategic aims that is of decisive significance. One must never put the horse behind the carriage.

The cause of detente could be supported by all countries, whether large, medium, or small. A country is not only able to, but it also must support it. As far as our countries, the socialist countries, are concerned the main thing is a coordinated foreign policy. There is a reliable platform for this, namely, in the form of decisions and resolutions accepted by the leaders of our countries in Sofia and Prague. The platform of Sofia and Prague is the platform of detente.

[Sereny, Zalai] It seems that Soviet foreign policy has attached new importance to Western Europe in recent months. What is the reason for this, and in your opinion, what are the common and what are the adverse points in the interests of the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries in the region?

[Zagladin] As I have already mentioned, our political line attaches great importance to developing relations with all states, within the limit of reality in today's world. At the same time, Europe plays an important role in our policies. In Europe -- as in other regions of the world -- the indispensable condition for lasting and positive processes is to respect the regional and political reality that developed after the two world wars, which consequently means, to reject the revanchist tendencies of the imperialist powers.

Europe's role in our political line is determined by both historical and current political reasons; it must not be forgotten that both world wars fell upon us from Europe. The period of detente demonstrated great opportunities and the good prospects inherent in all-European cooperation. These possibilities must be exploited in their entirety. As regards this issue, there are some aspects where the interests of the capitalist West and the socialist East coincide on our continent.

Judging from impressions based on speeches of West European political factors, the press and personal meetings, it is evident that the West European states are trying to gain greater freedom of action with the NATO alliance. I think this is the natural result of contradictions that in fact exist between the United States and the West European countries both in the economic and the political fields.

Apart from this tendency, which is positive on the whole as regards the cause of peace, there are other tendencies in Europe. For example, the fact that the FRG and the United Kingdom have in various degrees, agreed to take part in the U.S. SDI program gives cause for caution. This is a direct participation in further increasing the arms race, in physically preparing for a war. It appears that serious dangers lie also in the development of the plan for a European defence initiative, which is insisted on at present above all by the FRG. These plans could further increase the military confrontation in Europe, and indicate a threat to the present balance of power, namely, the military strategic balance.

One has no idea why these plans are necessary. It is mostly said that the threat from the East must be repulsed. Yet, there has never been and is no such threat. Actually, this fact is acknowledged by almost the majority of responsible leaders in the West European countries.

[Sereny, Zalai] How do you regard the all-European process 10 years after Helsinki and preceding the meeting in Vienna this year?

[Zagladin] Actually, that is what we have been discussing. Perhaps I can add that the successful development in the all-European and the Helsinki processes is above all disturbed by forces that are not of European nature. One does not have to be a foreign political expert to notice that the United States does everything it can to slow down or hinder entirely relations between the Eastern and the Western part of Europe. For this reason they plan to take both political and economic measures. The COCOM restrictions aim not so much at hindering the transfer of military technologies to the East (anyway, our countries have proved that they are able to solve any kind of problem as regards national defence), but rather at slowing down and curbing commercial, economic, technological, and scientific exchange between the two parts of this continent.

Of course, for an improvement in the all-European process it is necessary to achieve some progress at the Stockholm and Vienna negotiations. Our delegations and those of a good number of neutral and nonaligned countries strongly promote this cause. However, a considerable portion of the road still lies ahead of us before we achieve real success.

[Sereny, Zalai] It appears that with 1985 the world has stopped slipping backward to a cold war. In your view, where is the world heading for at present?

[Zagladin] Only one thing can be said with certainty, namely, that the world is heading for an increasing and widely fought battle against the dangerous war, for a return to

detente, and for a stable and peaceful coexistence. The United Nations has declared 1986 the year of peace. What we want is that this year -- and all the ones that follow -- indeed be the year of peace.

[Sereny, Zalai] Thank you for the interview.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1236

USSR: U.S. BEARS ONUS FOR EUROPEAN NUCLEAR PROBLEM

LD221734 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 22 Jan 86

["Dangerous Development of Events in Europe Must Be Stopped" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 22 TASS -- TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes: A set of proposals for strengthening security in Europe is among the more important parts of the large-scale Soviet program of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons, which has been formulated in a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Despite the nuclear problem in Europe having been under discussion for many years, the situation in the continent keeps worsening. The onus for this is wholly and squarely on the United States which has been refusing to look for mutually acceptable solutions to the problem of nuclear armaments in Europe in earnest.

Contrary to the national interests of European nations, American first-strike nuclear missiles are continuing to be deployed in the territories of several NATO member countries. Washington has supplemented its long-standing concept of a "limited" nuclear war in Europe with a no less dangerous "star wars" strategy. In keeping with the Pentagon's illusory yet dangerous plans, the anti-missile shield for the United States would make the aggressor safe if it unleashes a conflict in the European Continent, far from U.S. shores. The substance of this strategy of the Pentagon lies in making certain that it is primarily Europeans that will have to pay for the consequences of U.S. military ventures.

The Soviet Union has long been proposing delivering Europe from both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. As a first radical step in this direction, the USSR has now suggested eliminating all ballistic and medium-range cruise missiles of the USSR and the United States in the European zone as early as the first stage. The United States should make a commitment not to supply its strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France not to build up [as received] their corresponding nuclear forces.

At a time when the world public has expressed deep satisfaction with the new Soviet proposals, ultra-rightist quarters in the United States see them as a threat to their plans of whipping up the arms race, a threat to the lucrative business of churning out weapons of mass annihilation.

U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who only recently was eager to convince Europeans that the United States is seeking to eliminate the whole class of medium-range

weapons, is now saying something quite different, namely that even a reduction of American Pershings in Europe would be extremely dangerous in itself.

Pentagon spokesmen are also claiming that the destruction of all Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone would have no military significance since it would allegedly be possible to transfer the mobile missiles remaining in Asia to sites in Europe, thousands of kilometers away, as swiftly as hunting guns.

It should be recalled in this connection that the Soviet missiles in the east are meant only to offset the corresponding U.S. potential in the zone of Asia and the Pacific. They have not been installed there to be later moved from place to place. The USSR has repeatedly declared its readiness to respond with adequate measures to reductions of the American nuclear armory in the Far East. But the United States has been blocking the Soviet proposals for making Asia and the Pacific a zone of peace and cooperation.

The Soviet missiles will ultimately be scrapped also in Asia if the United States and other NATO countries accept the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament.

The question arises: If the geographical location of mobile missiles has no practical significance, as it is claimed in Washington, why wouldn't the Pentagon order the dismantling of American mobile missiles in Western Europe and their return to the United States? Washington, however, does not like the idea. Moreover, the American military is reluctant to include in the overall count its numerous medium-range missiles yet in U.S. territory. Nobody has any doubt, however, that these American missiles are intended for use in Europe rather than in the Western hemisphere.

The Soviet proposals concerning medium-range missiles in the European zone are no propaganda exercise, no attempt to outwit or outmaneuver the other side. The Soviet Union believes that the fulfillment of the new program for peace will help cut the Gordian knot of nuclear armaments in Europe and make this continent a safer place to live.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1237

USSR'S ZHOLKVER VIEWS NATO EXERCISES IN WEST GERMANY

LD220050 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1840 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary from the "International Dairy" program presented by Vitaliy Sobolev]

[Text] Major NATO military exercises have begun in West Germany. I shall ask our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver to talk about their aims and importance:

First of all, I must note that NATO armed forces exercises take place in the FRG every year, and the current ones are called "Reforger-86." This time, however, the particularly large number of troops and amount of equipment planned to take part in the maneuvers is most noteworthy -- 73,000 soldiers and 21,000 tanks and armored transports. Additional units of the U.S. and Canadian armies are being specially moved to West Germany for this purpose. Moreover, units of the Bundeswehr will be brought into action during the maneuvers.

By the way, another set of military exercises is beginning today, on the territory of Canada. U.S. cruise missiles will be flight-tested there. The Pentagon does not conceal that Canadian territory has been chosen as the testing ground because its terrain and climate are reminiscent of the northern regions of the USSR.

How are all of these facts to be assessed? They can only be assessed as the striving of certain circles in the United States to acquire military superiority over the USSR. This is confirmed by NATO's latest military plan as elaborated by U.S. General Rogers, its commander in chief. Excerpts from this plan, which is on the whole a secret one, have just appeared on the pages of THE WASHINGTON POST. It is plainly stated there that the Rogers plan envisages the deployment in Western Europe of modernized nuclear systems.

Let me remind you that as far back as 1979 the United States announced its intention to install [ustanovit] 572 of its nuclear missiles in West European NATO countries; 108 Pershings have already been delivered to the FRG. U.S. cruise missiles with nuclear warheads are being added to those in West Germany, Britain, Italy, and also in Belgium and Holland. These are the very same cruise missiles that are now being tested over Canada.

Moreover, judging from what THE WASHINGTON POST has published, the Rogers plan also aims to transfer the testing of nuclear shells for NATO artillery units to Western Europe. I also add that major stockpiles of U.S. chemical weapons are also located on the territory of the FRG. A few days ago THE NEW YORK TIMES, quoting officials in

Washington, confirmed that the administration is seeking the production of a new chemical weapon. Last but not least, let me note that, during the discussion of the U.S. draft budget for the next fiscal year, starting on 1 October, expenditure on the program for creating [sozdaniye] space weapons has been left untouched, and this year it will already amount to $2.75 billion.

No matter what type of weapon one looks at, therefore, one can see everywhere the U.S. effort to increase them. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement points out, however, the pursuit of the impossible dream of military superiority is a fruitless and dangerous policy. In our nuclear and space age, it is time to give stone-age thinking, when the main concern was to provide oneself with a bigger club and a heavier stone.

Now major scientists and politicians, in particular those who a few days ago held a routine session in the Indian capital of the so-called Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security, are stressing that genuine security in our time and the survival of all mankind can be ensured only by curbing the arms race. It is precisely by such striving that the major new peace initiatives put forward by our country and set out in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement are dictated.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1237

PARIS DAILY ANALYZES EUROMISSILES PROPOSAL

PM171218 Paris LE MONDE in French 17 Jan 86 p 3

[Article by Michel Tatu: "New Moves on the Euromissiles"]

[Text] As has been noted in Washington, it is on the Euromissiles that Mr Gorbachev's proposals represent a "step forward" and probably the most substantial one. If I understand correctly, Moscow is now suggesting a kind of "zero option" in this sphere, since the first stage of the plan makes provision for the simultaneous liquidation of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe, in other words of the 236 cruise and Pershing- 2 missiles deployed since 1983, and of the 243 SS-20 missiles targeted on the Old World. There is no longer any talk about the French and British forces at this stage.

If the proposal is confirmed at the negotiating table in Geneva, this would be an important change in the Soviet position since it had always put forward much more drastic preconditions for the destruction of the SS-20 missiles and this destruction implied until very recently taking account of Paris' and London's nuclear weapons.

The last known Soviet proposal seemed to entitle the Americans to around 100 cruise missiles (the Pershing-2 missiles were to be liquidated) compared with 210 SS-20 missiles, the difference in the number of warheads (530) corresponding to the combined French and British arsenals. The Americans, on the other hand, were proposing to set a ceiling of 140 "launchers" on each side, corresponding to that number of SS-20 missiles and to between 400 and 500 American warheads, depending on the relative numbers of Pershing and cruise missiles.

However, the Soviet plan involves serious concessions by the West. First, nothing has been said about the 200 or so SS-20 missiles deployed in Asia. Second, the United States would have to promise, even in the first stage, not to supply any missiles to their European allies, which would mean that London would have to abandon the Trident missiles ordered from Washington and make do with its existing Poseidon missiles. Third, Britain and France would have to freeze their arsenals now, which would mean that Paris would have to stop replacing M-20 submarine missiles with the MIRVed M-4 missiles. Finally, the two European powers would have to refrain from any nuclear tests in the second stage, in other words by 1990 at the latest, and completely abandon their arsenals after 1995, the start of the third stage.

However, it should be noted that this European section of the Soviet proposals is separate from the other two sections under discussion in Geneva which deal with space and intercontinental weapons. In other words, the establishment of an American space defense system would prevent a reduction in the two superpowers' central arsenals, but not the liquidation of the Euromissiles, which makes the hypothesis both more attractive and more plausible. Of course it remains to be seen whether this separation would still apply if the creation of a European ABM defense system was envisaged, as is being discussed by France and the FRG.

Perhaps the Soviet proposal is aimed precisely at preventing such an eventuality. But, in any case, it could upset the Western apple cart and give the public a different slant on the issue which seemed to have been decided with the implementation of the 1979 NATO decision.

/9738
CSO: 5200/2607

USSR: MBFR TALKS RESUME; OPPORTUNITY FOR ACCORD

Soviet Delegation Arrives

LD271639 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Vienna, January 27 TASS--A delegation of the U.S.S.R. arrived here today to take part in a scheduled round of the talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The Soviet delegation is led by Ambassador Valerian Mikhaylov.

MBFR Agreement 'Possible'

AU271250 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 27 Jan 86 p 4

[Article by APN "historian and expert on central Europe" N. Petrov on the Vienna MBFR talks: "After the Latest Soviet Proposals: Outline of a Solution in Sight"]

[Text] Moscow -- The fact that virtually no practical results have been achieved so far at the Vienna MBFR talks is primarily due to one reason: The NATO countries have made the main goal of the negotiations the elimination of an alleged disproportion in favor of the Warsaw Pact countries in the reduction area as regards ground forces and the most important types of conventional arms. Proceeding from this position, they have demanded "asymetric reduction;" in other words, a much larger reduction of the socialist states' ground forces than NATO's. In the endeavor to get out the of the cul de sac and find opportunity to conclude at least a partial agreement, the socialist countries submitted new proposals on 14 February. This initiative offers actual opportunities to achieve, first of all, concrete results in order to reduce the excessive concentration of troops and arms in the heart of Europe. It draws attention especially to those aspects of the negotiations where even now a mutually acceptable solution is taking shape and can be achieved.

On 5 December 1985 the NATO countries submitted their counterproposals. These proposals are now being carefully studied by the socialist countries and naturally, they still need to be more specifically defined. Nevertheless, the outlines of a possible solution are more or less taking shape. Such a situation is unprecedented in the history of the Vienna negotiations. This is undoubtedly a hopeful sign. The agreement that is in the offing will naturally require the implementation of verification measures.

However, it is obvious that they must be reasonable; in other words, that they must be in line with the commitments under the agreement and must not become a source of distrust and suspicion. Under no circumstances must such verification measures degenerate into reconnaissance work.

In this context attention should be especially focused on an important development in the position of the socialist countries that is mentioned in the statement by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of 15 January. As far as compliance with the commitment to freeze the numerical strength of the forces is concerned, it has now been proposed to establish, in addition to the national technical means, control points which would observe the transfer or withdrawal of any troop contingents in the reduction area. This constructive new step makes it possible to overcome the deadlock over the question of verifying compliance with an agreement. The Soviet Union and its allies are thus practically demonstrating their efforts to achieve success at the Vienna negotiations. If the other side really also wants this, then 1986 could become a milestone for the Vienna negotiations, Gorbachev stressed.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1239

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON NINTH CDE SESSION IN STOCKHOLM

Reagan Issues Statement

LD212241 Moscow TASS in English 2213 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 22 TASS -- President Reagan had a meeting in the White House with Robert Barry, the head of the U.S. delegation to the Stockholm Conference on Security and Confidence-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, in view of the next round of the conference due to open on January 28. A special presidential statement released by the White House says that "an accord with important implications for the overall East-West relations can be achieved there this year."

Number of Unresolved Issues

LD271900 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Tomorrow in Stockholm a regular session, the ninth, of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe opens. Taking part in our program is the leader of the Soviet delegation and roving ambassador, Oleg Alekseyevich Grinevskiy:

[Grinevskiy] The session opening tomorrow is perhaps one of the most crucial. The conference has chances for success, but there remains only just enough time for their realization. There is no small number of unresolved issues; for this reason the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has particular relevance for giving dynamism to the talks. It paves the way to resolving these unresolved issues.

Because it is a matter of raising confidence, the socialist countries, and other European states, want to better know and understand each other's intentions. For this it is necessary, in particular, to lower the threshold or providing information about large-scale land forces exercises compared with how this was envisaged in the Helsinki Final Act. But the Soviet Union proposes giving information not only about land forces exercises, but also about navy and air force exercises. Of course the experiences of not only the last war, but also contemporary conflicts have shown what importance and often decisive significance air and sea strikes have had and what great damage they inflicted. But the United States and NATO are trying to reduce

information to just the activity of land forces, cutting off the navy and air force.

Let us say straight that the conference literally got stuck on this issue, as they say -- it could not move in any direction. What can be done then? If there is no success for the moment in solving the issue as a whole, then why not do it in parts? Let's say, agree now on information about large-scale land forces and air forces exercises and transfer the issue of naval activity to the next stage of the conference. In such a way, the problem would not be removed, but tackled gradually, taking into account the security interests of all countries.

This is a just approach. It depends on the United States and NATO whether [the conference] continues to be locked on resolving this issue.

USSR Proposes 'Constructive Measures'

LD272329 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] The Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Rurope resumes in Stockholm tomorrow [28 January].

This will be the eighth [as heard] session of the conference, in which representatives of 33 European states and the United States and Canada are taking part. In the 2 years of its work, the forum in the Swedish capital has examined in detail the most varied aspects of European security. Meanwhile, it has become quite obvious that measures for trust in the military sphere will be able to be effective only if they are to be combined with major political actions to strengthen security on the Continent of Europe. At the end of the last round of the conference, the participants agreed to draft the outlines of a possible agreement. An important role in this direction is played by the draft submitted by the socialist states for a treaty with the NATO countries on mutual non-use of force and on maintaining peaceful relations. The socialist countries have also submitted a proposal for restricting the scale of military exercises in Europe and for notification of such exercises and major relocations of troops in general.

May I recall that at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva, both sides, attaching great importance to the Stockholm conference, stated their intention to promote its speedy and successful completion together with other states. But what do we see after Geneva? Thus far the United States has not responded to the USSR's call for an end to nuclear explosions, which would indisputably be a most important measure for mutual trust.

At the same time, the United States is staging major military maneuvers in various parts of the globe, from Honduras and South Korea to the FRG and the Mediterranean, which in fact are difficult to distinguish from troop deployments for commencing combat action.

Meanwhile, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement proposes constructive measures intended to create barriers in the path of the use of force and concealed preparation for war, be it on land, sea, or air. A considerable proportion of these measures concern Europe directly, the latter being called upon to play the role of the site for building detente. For it is in Europe, at the European conference in Helsinki, where

the decision to hold the conference on measures for trust and security in Europe was also adopted and where tangible examples of a new way of thinking, a new political psychology in the approach to the most important problems of today's world have been provided. Our country is also making its contribution to the cause of strengthening peace, cooperation, and international trust at the Stockholm conference.

Delegates' Remarks

LD282255 Moscow TASS in English 2236 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Text] Stockholm, January 28 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reporting:

A scheduled session of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe opened in the Swedish capital today. The delegates received with great interest the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, formulating a program of action to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, achieve disarmament, promote confidence and ensure dependable international security.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher, minister of foreign affairs of West Germany, stressed that the new proposals put forward in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement could give important impetuses to all current talks and provide possibilities for making progress. We and our allies, the minister said, are studying these proposals and will respond constructively to the new constructive elements they contain. These proposals aim for eliminating the threat of use of nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons. This meets with the fundamental interests of security in Europe.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher spoke with appreciation of the new proposals of the U.S.S.R. as regards verification ofthe reduction and elimination of arms which, in his words, could promote progress in bilateral and multilateral negotiations, including the Geneva talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. We agree with Mikhail Gorbachev's view that the Stockholm conference is called upon to put up barriers in the way of use of force or concealed preparations for war, the West German minister said.

Roland Dumas, minister for external relations of France, said that the new Soviet peace initiatives were of great interest and demanded serious analysis. He said that the proposal for a reduction of nuclear arsenals of the U.S.S.R. and the United States was a step in the right direction. Roland Dumas said that Mikhail Gorbachev's statement attached great importance to the Stockholm forum.

The statement made by the Soviet delegation stressed that the complex of the new Soviet initiatives also offered a key to resolving the outstanding problems at the Stockholm conference.

Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malta Alex Sceberras Trigona expressed concern over dangerous actions taken by the United States in the Mediterranean -- the actions that threatened peace in the region with which European security was linked closely.

All speakers at the conference session stressed the need of brisking up the Stockholm talks.

Notification Changes Proposed

LD281930 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 28 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] The Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament resumes work today in Stockholm. Its latest session is beginning. Delegations from 33 European countries, as well as from the United States and Canada -- that is from all 35 states which signed the Helsinki Act -- are meeting in the negotiations hall. Among the many journalists I was fortunate enough to be present at the opening of this conference, which took place on 17 January 1984, that is more than 2 years ago. Several sessions of the conference have taken place; quite a few speeches have been made; and quite a number of proposals put forward. However, no concrete result has been achieved. This result should be a mutually acceptable agreement on measures aimed at assisting a strengthening of confidence and security in Europe and the cause of disarmament.

At the same time, in the opinion of the Stockholm conference participants themselves and of the press, progress toward the goal which has been set can be observed. True, not at the tempo which they would like and not at on the scale which should be characteristic of such a representative conference. The statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in which are set forth the new Soviet peace-loving initiatives, also speaks about the Stockholm conference and contains an appeal to its participants to tackle the resolution of outstanding problems in an efficient manner.

What sort of problem is this? The worst bottleneck is the question of notification concerning large exercises of ground forces, the fleet, and air force. The socialist countries put forward a proposal at the conference on limiting the scale of military exercises in Europe, on notification of these exercises and of large movements and transfers of troops. This is an extremely timely measure if one considers that certain large military exercises are difficult to distinguish from the deployment of troops in order to begin combat action.

Representatives of the United States and other NATO countries try to avoid discussion of an agreement regarding the air force and the fleet. After all, it is precisely these that are the nuclear forces with the greatest striking power. Incidentally, yet another nuclear submarine entered into service a few days ago in the United States. Here it is -- it is called the Alaska and belongs to the Trident system. The boat can be equipped with 24 ballistic nuclear missiles. In turn, each of these missiles can be equipped with eight nuclear warheads. This is already the seventh Trident-type submarine. It is planned to produce a further five such missile-carriers and from 1989 the Pentagon intends to deploy even more powerful missiles, the Trident-2, on the submarine fleet.

The Soviet Union, in its new peace-loving program, proposes constructive solutions for the Stockholm conference too. If the question is not resolved in one go, Moscow proposes that its solution should be sought in sections. Let's say, to agree now on notification of large exercises of ground forces and of air forces and to leave the question of naval activity to the next stage of the conference.

With regard to all problems and all directions of activity to lessen international tension, to achieve a turn for the better in the international arena, leading to a reduction and to the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union is striving to find precisely such simple, constructive, precise, and effective solutions and calls upon Washington and its NATO allies to implement them. Moscow considers, believes, and is convinced that Europe can fulfill a special mission in the modern world -- that is the mission of rebuilding detente.

It is at this that the conference in Stockholm is also aimed. What could be more noble and important a task than measures to build confidence and security, than concrete deeds toward disarmament.

Soviet Proposals Provide Key

LD281855 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Station correspondent Valentin Gubernatorov report]

[Text] The ninth session of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe opened today in Stockholm. Our correspondent Valentin Gubernatorov reports from the Swedish capital:

The present session has begun its work in a favorable political climate. The statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has given rise to great interest among its participants. Many delegates are noting that this historic document provides the key to the solution of the problems at issue at the conference.

As is known, the aim of the Stockholm forum is to create reliable obstacles on the path to the use of force and covert preparations for war, whether on land, in the air or at sea. Opportunities to do this have been mapped out through the efforts of many states -- especially after the summit meetings in Paris and Geneva -- and the conference has approached the drawing up of a final document in earnest.

However, there are still a number of serious differences which the participants in the conference have to overcome. The proposals by Comrade Gorbachev -- expressed in the statement -- are directed towards overcoming them. For example, the question of the advance notification of major exercises: Until this problem is solvable in total, the Soviet Union proposes that it should be resolved in parts -- to reach an accord now on notification of major exercises by land forces and the air force and to postpone the question of naval activity to the next stage of the conference. The socialist countries are also proposing that the numbers of troops participating in major exercises be reduced, and that the scale of such exercises be significantly restricted. The United States and its NATO allies are still evading serious consideration of these problems. Meanwhile, the exercises which they are holding in Europe are at time difficult to distinguish from the deployment of troops for the waging of combat operations.

In order to prevent the possibility of any war arising, the socialist states have proposed that a treaty be concluded on the nonuse of force and the maintenance of relations of peace. But the neutral and nonaligned countries have in principle already spoken out in support of the adoption of such a pledge.

'Political Baggage' at Talks

LD281528 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Excerpt] What political baggage are the conference participants bringing back to Stockholm with them? Valentin Gubernatorov, northern European correspondent, replies to this question:

The socialist countries' proposals regarding the notification of major exercises by and troops and also by air forces and navies remain on the negotiating table. The socialist countries are also proposing a reduction in the level of the numbers of troops taking part in major military exercises. At the same time, they advocate an important restriction on the scale of such exercises.

However, the United States and their NATO allies have so far avoided any serious examination of this matter. Meanwhile, the exercises which they are conducting in Europe are assuming such a scale that it is sometimes hard to distinguish them from the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of troops for carrying out military actions. The USSR also considers it essential to make specific and validate the principle of the nonuse of force. The socialist countries' proposal to conclude an agreement on mutual nonuse of force and the maintenance of peaceful relations is, as is known, directed to this end, thereby averting the possibility of any outbreak of war -- nuclear or conventional.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1239

END